

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY



U 1620 0351 4303

The Catholic Hour of the Prairies

— ● —

BX
885
P65
1952
c.1

BARD

1951 - 1952

v. Martin Foley C.Ss.R.



EX LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTÆNSIS

**THE
ATTITUDES OF THE
CATHOLIC CHURCH**

THE ATTITUDES OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

NINETEEN ADDRESSES DELIVERED ON
THE CATHOLIC HOUR OF THE PRAIRIES,
PRODUCED BY THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS
OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN
DECEMBER 5th, 1951 THROUGH APRIL 16th, 1952

By

Rev. Martin J. Foley, C.Ss.R.
of St. Mary's Church,
Saskatoon, Sask



DIOCESE OF SASKATOON,
SASKATOON, SASKATCHEWAN



Printed by St. Peter's Press,
Muenster, Sask.

IMPRIMI POTEST:

VERY REV. G. J. EHMAN, C.S.S.R.
V-PROV. SUP.

die 18^a MARTIUS, 1952

NIHIL OBSTAT:

REV. BERNARDUS DUNN.
CENSOR LIBRORUM

die 1^a APRILIS, 1952

IMPRIMATUR:

® PHILIPPUS FRANCISCUS POCKOCK
ADMINISTRATOR SASKATOONENSIS

die 18^a APRILIS, 1952

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. The Catholic Church and Attitudes	7
2. The Catholic Church on Authority and Democracy	13
3. The Catholic Church on Freedom and Censorship	19
4. The Catholic Church on Drink	25
5. The Catholic Church on Gambling	30
6. The Catholic Church on Literature and Movies	35
7. The Catholic Church on Mercy-Killing	40
8. The Catholic Church on Marriage	46
9. The Catholic Church on Mixed Marriage	51
10. The Catholic Church on Pomp and Ritual	57
11. The Catholic Church on Brotherhood	64
12. The Catholic Church on Priests and Nuns	70
13. The Catholic Church on Science	76
14. The Catholic Church on Psychiatry	82
15. The Catholic Church on Purgatory	88
16. The Catholic Church on Business	95
17. The Catholic Church on Mary	102
18. The Catholic Church on Sorrow	109
19. The Catholic Church on Joy	115

RADIO BROADCAST

I.

"The Attitude of the Catholic Church."

Dear Radio Friends:

Hardly a day passes but our newspapers and national magazines carry reports of some new pronouncement by the Catholic Church on human affairs. It may be an address by the Pope to an International Congress of scientists meeting in Rome. Or it may be a world-wide encyclical on the relations between Capital and Labour. It may be almost anything dealing with world peace, human progress and activity. Now, some people feel that the Catholic Church, in so speaking out, is stepping beyond the bounds of religion; that she is interfering where she has no business; in a word, they feel that religion is something for Sunday morning in church and has no place in the affairs of men the rest of the week.

The fact of the matter, of course, is that religion is not a pious coat to be worn to church on Sunday morning and then hung up and forgotten the rest of the week. Rather, religion, because, it is not just another cog in man's make-up, but embodies his whole philosophy and understanding of life, must run as an undertone through every possible phase of human activity. And that is why the Catholic Church has a very definite attitude towards the religious aspect that underlies the actions of men and nations. Evidently, the Church is not concerned with the purely secular side of human affairs. She is not interested, for example, in whether a nation deals in pigs or potatoes; nor is it any concern of hers whether Saskatoon decides to put in more traffic lights or not. And she is not in the least bit interested in whether a man drives a Ford, or a Buick or just plain walks. For all this is none of her business. But when nations act for or against the well-being of the whole human race; when society legislates for the happiness of its members; when a man acts as a rational human being composed of body and soul — then the Catholic Church does

have an attitude. Because you see she cannot agree that life is a meaningless jumble, a frantic grubbing about to make money and nothing more. She believes that life has a meaning; that everything has its place in an overall Master Plan that is the blueprint of all existence from top to bottom. What precisely is that blueprint that unifies life so wonderfully? Of what is it composed?

A. TRIPLE RELATION:

It is based on three things: Man's relation to his Creator, his relation to his fellowmen in society, and finally, his relation to himself as a human being. The Catholic Attitude is based, first of all, on Man's relation to his Creator. The Catholic Church believes that God is the beginning and the end, the guide, purpose and goal of everybody and every possible thing; that all creation was made by Him and must gravitate towards Him, under pain of forever being out of joint. About us, a hundred million elements go to make up our universe and so staggering are the order, beauty and harmony in nature that the Church says all this could not possibly have been flung together by a stupid nothingness called blind chance. Even the first application of Man's native common sense — to say nothing of the rigorous proof afforded by cold reason — rule out this thing called blind chance for what it is — preposterous. The marvellous organization found everywhere, from the tiniest atom to the greatest planet, betray the inventive genius of a personal and infinitely intelligent Creator and Keeper in existence whom we simply call God. And among all God's creatures, the noblest, most necessary and only responsible agent on earth, is Man. Because of his intelligence and will, Man is made in the image and likeness of his Maker and his dignity springs both from this and from the ultimate destiny for which he was created, namely, eternal happiness with God in heaven.

The Catholic Attitude is also based on a proper understanding of the function of Society. . . Man's relations with his fellow-men. Basic, essential and first as the necessary unit of society, is the family. In a larger sense the entire human race forms one world family or community, regardless of color, creed or nationality. The state, therefore is nothing else than the union of many families banded together so that the rights of individuals may be protected through the united strength and authority of the whole. From this it follows that the State is but the servant of the people, not their master; it rules de-

pendent upon the will of the governed and fulfills its function of promoting the common good when it safeguards the peace and prosperity of its citizens. But don't stop there. Remember that the State is not set up merely to guarantee Man his due happiness. Man is made for greater things than that. His ultimate goal is heaven, not earth. Therefore, any State or Society that fails to recognize Man's spiritual side and tries instead to make an earthly Utopia for the be-all and end-all of his existence, that Society ends in steady discord; it is simply out of joint. At best it is a godless society; at worst it is Communism.

Finally, the Catholic Attitude is based on a true understanding of who and what Man is in himself. It recognizes a human being for what he is — a free and independent sovereign as what concerns his personal personal rights, sovereignty when on his authority of the state, in whatever, touches upon the common good in civil society and total is dependent and therefore is subject to God through His Church, where moral precepts and doctrines of Faith are at stake.

CONCLUSION:

That then, is the Master Plan that governs the Catholic Attitude. It is a fallible because it is based on the true nature of God, Society and Man as revealed by the Creator Himself. And you will find that every crisis in human affairs comes about because someone or some group tried to throw that order of things out of joint. Atheism, for example, is nothing else than the creature trying to dethrone the Creator and set himself up in the place of God. But that's old stuff. Lucifer tried it in Heaven long ago. And he got Hell for his pains. Wars are the result of some members of the human family trying to lord it over their brothers; again, vaulting ambition and pride gone berserk and throwing the peace and harmony of Society out of step. But it is especially Man, left to himself who is particularly prone to throw things out of order by emphasizing one aspect of human affairs out of all proportion to the whole. All down the ages, every heresy that split Catholics away from the Church began as a result of someone pushing a good idea to the extreme of absurdity. Back in the fourth century, for example, the Montanists allowed their hatred of lust to push them into the absurd position of saying that marriage itself was sinful. — one extreme; today there are some who say that everybody should get married — the other extreme and just as foolish.

Some think drunkenness quite normal to Man. and others, going to the opposite extreme, would rule out drink for everybody. "In medio stat virtus" goes an old Latin proverb that might freely be translated as "Truth lies in moderation." Keeping everything in its proper place and proportion. This lies the genius of the Catholic Church in her attitude towards life. Her tremendous wisdom, however, is not her own. It is borrowed from the Divine Truth revealed by God through Christ and through Christ to His Church. That is why Catholics think with the Church as the old saying goes. For she herself is but echoing the words of St. Paul "Let this mind be in you that was also in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 2. 5). In the following broadcasts, I shall try to show you now that applies to almost every aspect of our daily life.

God Bless You

J. M. J. A. M.

DEC. 5th 1951

QUESTION BOX.

ANNOUNCER

"WHAT ABOUT THE QUESTION BOX THIS YEAR FATHER?"

ANSWER.

Yes. Dear Friends we are going to continue the Question Box this year. By all means. It seems to have become a very popular item on our program. I have tried to incorporate most of the more popular questions into the talks themselves this season and you will notice them unfolding week by week. However if there is anything at all you would like to know about Catholics or the Catholic Church, just send your questions in and we'll try to answer them to your satisfaction.

Now for tonight's question. I think we have time for one, anyway. Here it is. A great deal of violent abuse and name-calling has been heaped at the Pope lately, because of something he said recently in an address to Italian midwives. Now, in all charity I wonder how many of the critics took the trouble to read the official text of the address and get the thing straight before going off half-cocked. What the pope said was simply that to save the life of a pregnant mother was certainly a good and noble end, but that it was never permitted to directly kill her unborn child in order to do

so. Now, that is so elementary and obvious a principle of all morality that one wonders how the critics could possibly fail to see it. The principle is the universal and true truth that the end does not justify the means. You may not even directly murder an unborn child to save the mother. Then you may directly murder the mother to save the unborn child. Every human being is a human being in the sight of God and equally sacred, whether it be an unborn child or a full-grown man. So what Pope Pius stated was a simple application of one of the first of all moral principles: namely, that a good end does not justify the use of means which means to attain it. It is as simple as that.

And all those other considerations about the child being born mentally defective anyway or the mother having a whole family depending on her—all that does not change the basic principle involved. The moment you try to water down the clear-cut principle with considerations like that you end up in the quagmire and chaos of expediency. And then, of course, anyone can come right back at you and say: Suppose it could be foreseen that the child would grow up to be the Prime Minister or a great leader who would someday save an entire nation; not just one family: what would you do then? Murder the mother?

The whole thing is nonsensical. We love our mothers as dearly as anyone. But we also know that the end does not justify the means. Willful direct murder is just that—murder and you can never use it to attain any end, however good. The Pope also added the other classic case which is just as evident and I hope his critics noticed it: namely, that if the mother's life is in danger from disease, then evidently she may be operated on for the disease even though her child's life is lost as a secondary and unwanted effect of the operation. Because then, it is not the child's life you are going after, but directly and primarily the disease. Which, of course, is an entirely different case.

PRAYER.

Many have asked me to repeat this year, the beautiful prayer for peace
by St. Francis of Assisi, the Church's founder of the Franciscan Order
Gladly I do so

Lord, make me an instrument of thy peace
Where there is hatred, let me sow love,
Where there is injury, pardon
Where there is doubt, faith
Where there is despair, hope
Where there is darkness, light
Where there is sadness, joy

O Divine Master grant that I may not so much seek
To be consoled, as to console
To be understood as to understand.
To be forgiven, as to forgive

For

It is in giving that we receive,
It is in pardoning that we are pardoned.
It is in dying, that we are born to eternal life Amen

RADIO BROADCAST

2.

"The Catholic Church on Authority and Democracy."

Dear Radio Friends

I ought, we start out on a great and to me a fascinating adventure — to watch the unfolding of the genius of the Catholic Church as applied to the affairs of man. That genius, as I said last week, is not merely the accumulated wisdoms of experience gathered over the course of centuries. To be sure, it is also that. But the basic, eternal principle that underlies and inspires the Catholic Church's attitude has always been God's own revelation concerning the true nature of Man — his relations to his Creator, to his fellowmen in Society and to himself. It is this unwavering fidelity to the Divine blueprint of existence that has kept the Church from going off the deep end. There has never been a moment when a captive of one extreme that perished it into destruction. Whereas, the Church in the words of the famous Quaker, has been like "a heavenly chariot that flies thundering through the ages, the dull heretics sprawling and prostrate the wild truth rearing but erect. And nowhere is that wonderful balance, that sane harnessing of both extremes, more evident than in the oft task of the Catholic Church towards Authority and Democracy.

A. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND AUTHORITY.

Let's take this business of Authority first. Now, even the word, Authority, seems to have fallen into something of disrepute these days. It has become suspect, it conjures up in the minds of many, the menacing shadow of totalitarianism, with all that that word implies — police states, concentration camps and the suppression of personal liberty. But I say this. In spite of all the abuses committed throughout history in the name of Authority, the fact remains that Authority is not only something good, we simply cannot live without it. For Au-

flourish is nothing else than the right to command and enforce obedience. And only a moment's thought is needed to see how absolutely vital authority is to the peace and good order of human affairs. A father of a family, for example, must have and exercise the authority that goes with his position as head of the home; otherwise his household is bedlam. Every society must have the right to command its citizens and enforce obedience; otherwise you'd have civil chaos. That is why here in Salsation we do realize the need of a mayor and city council to guide and control the overall affairs of the city; we all see the need of a police department to enforce the rules and bylaws. Otherwise the town would end up in confusion twice confounded and as the old saying goes "we'd all be murdered in our beds." That is what we mean then, by the authority that is vested in Society. Finally, there is the Authority that is in God. Since He created every thing, all authority ultimately goes back to Him, and God's right to that authority rests on His title of Creator.

So there you have the perfect pyramid of Authority, which is our guarantee of harmony and peace. First, all Authority resides in God. Then He shares it with men, His creatures, who in turn, for their own common good, set up a Society or State, and hand over to that Society part of their God-given authority, so that the State may then use it to protect the personal rights of the individual citizen. In that way, quarrels and chaos in Society are avoided; men are prevented from letting their passions and whims run wild to the detriment of their fellowmen and peace reigns over all. Authority has fulfilled its task.

II THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND DEMOCRACY

But then a difficulty arises. Authority is only our strong shield protecting the universal Truth and common happiness. What is to prevent Authority itself from getting out of hand and degenerating into the tyranny of totalitarism? There is nothing to prevent it from doing so. In fact, human nature being what it is, that is exactly what Authority tends to do, unless protected from itself. Power corrupts. And so, the Catholic Church wisely balances the truth of Authority with the equally divine truth about Democracy.

In this connection, it might be well to mention that we usually tend to think of the American Declaration of Independence, written by Thomas Jefferson as the first statement of what we call modern

democracy. The fact of history, however, is that some 200 years before Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence St. Robert Bellarmine, a cardinal and theologian of the Catholic Church, had embodied in a book the age-old teaching of the Church on every one of the fundamental rights of Man. And today, Jefferson's copy of the cardinal's book, originally handwritten, can still be seen in the American Library of Congress. Briefly then the Church's teaching on the rights of Man, that constitute the foundation of Democracy is this: Every man is directly created by God; every man has certain inalienable rights that were given to him by his Creator and which belong to him by very reason of his nature as Man. Therefore, the State — Man's over creation for the protection of his personal rights — the State is not the source or giver of Man's natural rights. Man does not belong to the State; the State belongs to Man; Man does not exist for the State; the State exists for Man; the State does not give Man his authority. Man goes to the State whatever measure of authority he wishes it to possess; he hands over that measure of authority when he elects a government to office. And if he doesn't like the way the State uses the authority he loaned it, he withdraws it, by voting that particular government out of office. That is Democracy, government as Lincoln put it: "of the people, for the people and by the people."

CONCLUSION:

There, then, is the perfect balance between Authority and Democracy. Once Authority is properly established, then for the sake of stability it is not to be withdrawn nor is abused. A father of a family always retains his authority as head of the house unless he unjustly abuses it. And nowadays, the very vocal democracy that are his wife and children, is not likely to let him abuse it. A government remains in power until voted out by the people because they feel it has abused or is not fulfilling its mandate. Finally, the authority of God can never be voted out of office, first, because God can never abuse it and secondly, because the authority of God is his own; it was not given to Him by His creatures and does not depend on them.

Here on earth the Catholic Church is not committed to any particular form of human government. She tries to get along with all of them, though she usually flourishes best in a democratic society. Her greatest troubles all down the centuries, have been with absolute

monarchs of long ago, and the Totalitarian and Liberal states of modern times. In both cases, the trouble stemmed from an absolute king or would-be almighty State that arrogated to itself the place of God and usurped the basic rights of Man. For that reason, then, she never ceases to proclaim to the whole world, the divinely revealed truth about the balance between Authority and Democracy.

God bless you.

J. M. J. A. M.

DEC. 12th 1951

QUESTION BOX.

QUESTION

'DID THE LATE KING GEORGE VI OF ENGLAND BECOME A CATHOLIC SHORTLY BEFORE HE DIED?'

ANSWER

I haven't the slightest idea. I've heard rumors to that effect, but have never been able to find any facts to substantiate the claim. It was also rumored that Edward the VIIIth was received into the Church shortly before his death and in his case there seems to be some basis for the statement. One of Edward VIIIth's closest friends was the famous Father Vaughan, who was called to his bedside more than once during the King's last illness, so I am told. However, to answer your question, I simply do not know whether or not George VIth was received into the Church before he died. As you probably know, British kings are forbidden by English Law to become Catholics, under pain of losing the throne. Princess Elizabeth and Princess Margaret Rose are likewise forbidden by law to marry Catholics. However, a great deal of that old bitterness is dying out in England and I suppose, will eventually disappear altogether, for there are now many millions of Catholics within the framework of the British Commonwealth of nations.

QUESTION

THE THING THAT POSITIVELY INFURIATES ME ABOUT YOU CATHOLICS IS THE WAY YOU HOLD YOURSELVES ABOVE OTHERS. YOU ARE NARROW, INTOLERANT, NONCOOPERATIVE AND DOGMATIC. YOU THINK YOURSELVES ALWAYS RIGHT AND EVERYBODY ELSE ALWAYS WRONG."

ANSWER

Well, now, you certainly got a load off your chest, that runs, doesn't it? But tell me, do you really believe that about us? Then do a little checking and I think you'll find that in every other field of human activity Catholics share every one else's opinions. In politics, for example, some Catholics are strongly liberal and others are just as strongly conservative, and so on. Some doctors who are Catholics hold certain medical opinions, while other Catholic doctors hold just the opposite. You even support some Catholics' plan for the Quakers and others, heaven help them, plan for Buddhism. In fact, in every other field of human endeavor Catholics like everyone else can be found on every possible side of the fence.

I say in every other field. Because when it comes to religion, Catholics are one crucial one, they are and must be otherwise, they are not Catholic. You see, we believe that there is one God that He came down here on earth not only to save us by His death on the cross, but that He also came to give of men till the end of time a definite body of truths to believe and a very definite way of life to live if they want to get to heaven. We also believe that He founded a Church. His Church to protect that teaching till the end of time. To keep it from being changed or watered down is not the weakness of human nature.

No, now we do not believe that our Lord taught only a vague, generalized sort of Christianity and then left it to every man to pick and choose as he pleased, putting his own private interpretation on it. That was sound and up with exactly what you have today — about 300 kinds of churches, all giving their own man-made interpretations of what Christ taught. To us that simply does not make sense. No wonder the pagans call it the scandal of a divided Christianity. No, we believe Christian Dogma — truth is one and the same for all men and that it is absolutely unchangeable, just as 2 and 2 equal 4 is unchangeable, and that your or my opinion about Christ

unity does not matter one blessed bit; that the only opinion that does matter is Christ's.

Now, if that is being narrow, intolerant and dogmatic, then I'm afraid we shall have to plead guilty. But then, I believe that if you think it over, you would want to too.

PRAYER

Lord make me an instrument of Thy peace
Where there is hatred, let me sow love,
Where there is injury, pardon
Where there is doubt, faith
Where there is despair, hope
Where there is darkness, light
Where there is sadness, joy

O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek
To be consoled, as to console,
To be understood as to understand
To be forgiven as to forgive.

For,

It is in giving that we receive,
It is in pardoning that we are pardoned
And it is in dying that we are born to eternal life Amen

RADIO BROADCAST

2.

"The Catholic Church on Freedom and Censorship."

Dear Radio Friends:

I don't suppose there is a more popular word in the English language today, than the word Freedom. Freedom, or liberty, shines in the troubled world about us like a bright flame in the darkness. Men fight and gladly die to preserve their freedom. Sadly, we look across the seas where all too many have lost their precious freedom, while we at home the very word Freedom rings out like a clarion call summoning a million to the defence of their liberty. Go where you will, everywhere you will hear people talking about their freedom.

I want to be free to do as I please, to go where I want, to act any way I wish. That we are told is freedom.

By the same token men hate censorship. They instinctively recoil from anything that would hobble their actions, restrict their movement, hamper their precious liberty. All of which poses a very pretty problem. Just how far should freedom extend, and how far is it to be counterbalanced by censorship, if at all. The Catholic Church has some very definite things to say about the balance between liberty and censorship, and again as always her teaching is based on what God has revealed about it.

A. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND FREEDOM.

Consider first of all this business of freedom. By the way, just what is freedom or liberty? Are we free? If so, where did we get our freedom and are there any restrictions on it? To begin with, let's get a clear idea of what freedom means. Freedom is the state of being exempt from the domination of others or from restricting circumstances. That being so, where did we get our freedom? Certainly not from ourselves. We did not even create ourselves, let alone create ourselves free. No, everything that we are or possess comes to us from the God who made us. He is the only one who could of His own free

will make us in such a way that we would be exempt from the domination of others, whether people or things.

Very well then. We are free because God made us free. When, if He had wanted to, He could have made us slaves. How much freedom did God give us – is it unlimited? Not at all. The freedom God put in us is not an absolute freedom to do anything and everything we might want to do. How can we know that? Well, our very definite proof is to be found in the words of Our Divine Father in Heaven and the Holy Spirit: "The Truth shall make you free."

(John 8:32) Not any word whatever is going to do whatever when and how we like it, but what the Holy Spirit dictated. Freedom then does not mean the right to do as we please, but the right to do as we ought. The Truth is what surrounds and leads out persons to do as in order to preserve it.

We see all too often persons who possess a law and the universe that stand on one side and are continuously defied by it. Knowing as we recognize and also love laws we cannot help. For example, we are not free to jump off a cliff because the moment you do so the law of gravity acts instantaneously and you are falling down. If you do that you are jumping off a cliff, meaning that nothing will limit your freedom – because now you're not free, you're dead. In like manner, the law of God is limiting the actions of his very definitely limits your freedom to lead around with matches. And thus it is with all the moral principles of nature. They limit your liberty not to take of you, but to preserve it.

Freedom then, as I have understood, does not mean the right to do as you please, but to do as you should. You are free to do as you should toward the Lord who made you and who keeps you alive, keeping that proposition that God set up between you and Him self is what preserves our freedom. Because as Our Lord put it:

"the Truth shall make you free." In the second place you are free to do as you should towards your fellow human creatures. Defy that law and you are not free, you're in jail, exactly, you are free to do as you should towards yourself towards fulfilling your destiny not as an animal, but as a rational human being. Defy that law and you are not free, you're in hell.

B. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH ON CREATIONISM

That, then, is the freedom side of the picture. Now what about creationism? I have said that nobody likes it, and that is true. Our per-

verse human nature rebels at the very thought of restriction. Yet, very soon man giving but a moment's pause, sees that censorship is absolutely necessary if he is to live in any kind of peace and good order. Every man, for example, realizes that he must impose a certain censorship on his driver, his accountant or his child. If he does, impose that censorship, he keeps his health and his sanity. If he doesn't, he ends up in a mad house. Every man's mind needs the sound of a certain amount of censorship. It is to ensure the safety and peace of the community. That is why you have a Government. For I need law to keep your body from being poisoned and your business from being poisoned and your reputation from being poisoned. That too is why censorship is your freedom of speech. At one time, censorship information was not used, why also freedom of speech was not used and a war against the whole nation, for it spread dissatisfaction throughout the country. All this was done for protection and for the sake of the common good. Finally, every man's mind needs a certain amount of censorship which his Creator is constituted. No man is worthy to attempt, as the right to attack God or to deny His existence. That seems to be quite a bad theory, and I for one am not a little sick and tired of hearing people praise and prattle about the right to attack anything under the sun even God. Just because these people think they get the right to attack God is the reason He is so much further from their reach. Since they don't have the right to attack Him, they are in a position to start giving themselves rights about anything. When then did they get the right to attack God from Society. Society is nothing but a man-made creation for the protection of the personal rights. Man entered from God in the first place. No Society gives no man the right to attack God, for the very good reason that Society is such, has no rights to give.

All down the centuries, the Catholic Church has tried to keep Man right on the proper balance between true freedom and true censorship. When freedom slipped being true and ran wild, you had physical, mental and spiritual anarchy. For then Man instead of doing as he should let his passions run wild and did as he pleased, with regard to God, Society and his own personal life. And that is anarchy, chaos.

On the other hand, when censorship got out of hand, Man's spirit was crushed. Whenever he repudiated his proper relation to the true God, he found that his new god became a tyrant, when

society employed too much censorship, men found that the State became not their servant but their master, when the creature forgot or denied his dignity as a rational human being, he found that his spirit became the prisoner of his body and sank into the vile servitude of animality.

Some freedom, then, must ever be balanced with some censorship and that eternal balance, as always, depends upon the truth of things revealed by God. That truth that alone can make and keep us free.

God bless you

J. M. J. A. M.

DEC. 19th, 1951

QUESTION BOX.

3.

QUESTION

WHY SHOULD CATHOLICS BE FORBIDDEN TO READ CERTAIN BOOKS? I BELIEVE IN THE FREEDOM OF THE HUMAN MIND. I BELIEVE THAT THE MIND SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO LOOK AT ALL SIDES OF ANY QUESTION AND TO JUDGE THE TRUTH FOR ITSELF.

ANSWER.

You certainly wouldn't think that way, if you'd just pause to consider some plain, down to earth facts. The mentality of 'I can read any old thing I want to and it doesn't affect me. I can take it or leave it as I please.' There's nothing, e.g., to be wondered about that, that's just plain wish thinking. There are two kinds of reading forbidden not only to Catholics, but to everyone. The first kind is immoral reading, the kind that not merely describes the sins that men commit, but does it in such a way, with its plain obscene descriptions and cleverly worded arguments in favour of adultery, free-love and so on, that it ordinarily creates a strong incentive to sin in the average person. The existence of such reading is a fact of human existence you might just as well admit and stop feeling awfully. The Catholic Church, therefore, which holds that sin is the only real evil in the world, forbids her children to read anything that would probably lead to it, just as a good mother would.

snatch her child away from the edge of a cesspool. Or would you rather have the child fall in and learn the hard way?

The other kind of reading that is forbidden, is the kind that endangers the Faith, that is, Man's adherence to the truth about God as He Himself has revealed it. And the reason for that prohibition is this: the average person who is a very ordinary creature is neither near as intellectually equipped to cope with glib writers who, with a dazzling display of show and wit, blast the Faith right out of the average person. Not because their arguments are good and you have heard them. But because the average person is either not intelligent enough to get things, the words and spot the flaws, or not spiritually strong enough to want to spot them. The Catholic Church knows that the Faith is the greatest of all treasures a man can possess whether he himself treasures it or not. And therefore she forbids him to read whatever could destroy it. That is not an attack of freedom; it is simply the prudent protection of a treasure. Just as a sensible man, with a fortune of jewels in the house, doesn't allow every Tom, Dick and Harry to come in and inspect them. And the further proof of the Church's sensible attitude about the whole thing is this: That anyone who can show that the treasure of his Faith is secure, can, for a grave reason, obtain permission to read books generally forbidden.

QUESTION

"WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FATE AND WHAT PEOPLE GENERALLY CALL DIVINE PROVIDENCE?"

ANSWER

That's a very good question. *Fate* denies the existence of God and that Man has free-will. *Divine Providence*, on the other hand, affirms both. The *fatalist* denies the existence of God; he believes that accidents and catastrophes occur without any intelligent plan behind them, and no worthwhile purpose to be attained from them. He does not believe that he has free-will, but rather holds that a blind and mysterious fate obliges him to do whatever he does, be it good or evil. And so, very logically, he concludes: "Whatever happens, has to happen anyway. I can't help what I do; therefore I can do as I please." In that very convenient way, he relieves himself of all moral responsibility for his acts, believing himself to be but a pawn in the hands of a blind fate.

The Christian, on the other hand, believes in Divine Providence. He believes in God. He believes that nothing ever happens, not even a world war, without the knowledge and permission of an all-wise God. He believes that there is an intelligent purpose to be fulfilled by such events. He himself may not be able to understand that purpose right here and now, so himself may even suffer greatly in the working out of that Divine Plan. But he knows that God will unfold the meaning of everything, in heaven. Thus a Christian knows that he *has* free will to choose good or evil, to deserve heaven or hell. In a word, he accepts full moral responsibility for obeying or disobeying God's commandments. Fate, you will find, leads to wickedness and despair. Divine Providence, on the other hand, leads a Christian to submit to the wisdom and authority of the God who made him.

RADIO BROADCAST

4

"The Catholic Church on Drink."

Dear Radio Friends:

With the Christmas season in full swing, it is not at all out of place to speak about drink. In fact, I think it is very much in order. For drink has played, is playing now and will continue to play an important part in the educational process which has abounded this time of year. Now it is not easy to speak about drink without arousing very violent reactions either for or against it. Some people who like to consider themselves broad-minded about the whole thing, believe it is quite all right for a person to get drunk every now and then; nothing is going to hurt you, but just that you *should* have the right to do more if you want to and take. After all, they ask, what's wrong with it? On the other hand, you have many sincere and well-intentioned people who go to the opposite extreme. In their eyes, all drinking is sinful, all liquor is an evil and every man who takes a drink at all has also taken the first step on the road to hell.

Between these two extremes stands the Catholic Church on the business of drink. She has some fundamental principles to guide her and these are based, as always, on what God had to say about it. That her attitude rings true and is eminently sensible, I leave you to judge.

A. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE RIGHT TO DRINK

Consider, first of all, the basic question in this whole discussion: Is drink, *strictly in itself* or not? Is liquor inherently evil? The answer is no, it is not. Nothing God created is evil in itself. Wrong or evil consists in the misuse of things, in the violation of their rightful use. And there is nothing in the world that cannot be misused. A person may make a glutton of himself with food and eat himself into an early grave; not a few do. But food is not for that reason evil in itself. Shotguns are highly dangerous and every fall many people are killed through careless or dangerous handling of them. But shotguns

we not for that reason evil and no one in his right mind would dream of forbidding anyone to go hunting. Each year tens of thousands of people are either killed or maimed for life in automobile accidents. Most of the time these accidents happen because of careless or dangerous stupidity on the road. But automobiles are not for that reason mechanical death in themselves. In all these cases, the situation is the same. It is not the object that is to blame, but the person who misuses it.

The same holds true for drink. It is potentially dangerous just as many other things in life can become dangerous. But if it does, it is not the fault of drink itself, but the fault of the person who abuses it. Therefore provided a person can handle drink reasonably and properly, he has a perfect right to benefit by this one of God's gifts. And any law that tries to prevent him from using it reasonably is an unjust law. That was what was wrong with Prohibition as written in the United States some years ago. Not only was it a failure in point of achievement. It was an unwarranted violation of civil liberties and human responsibility, presenting a picture which could not be set in concrete for all to see. That was including everyone to drink. It was that there must be any accidents or the forbidding freedom of speech to everyone, so that no one will consent label Puritan drinking a much more prevalent but the principle remains the same in both cases.

Mark well what I said and in ages. A man has a perfect right to drink provided he can use it properly and reasonably in other words, provided he can drink like a rational human being. Some people can not do that. They are so built that they cannot touch even one drink without going the whole way and getting drunk. I meet such circumstances. I would be a witness in for such persons to take even one drink for them. I also abstain from a whole lot. I agree. And there is no finer group of men anywhere than the doctors. Ancestors who make their lives their money and find themselves succeeding. They are most worthy of all praise.

But if a man cannot leave and enjoy a drink at home whether reading a book, with some company or friend, or a workman can enjoy a glass of beer after a hard day's work and return to his family sober and a gentleman, nobody in the world has an business whatever trying to take away his right to this enjoyment. He may want to forgo his right to drink in order not to become an unwitting temptation to those who are weak in this regard. If he does so fine. He is doing a

noble and charitable thing. But as long as he can handle drink properly himself no one can take away his right to do so.

B. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND TEMPERANCE

So much then on the right to drink. Counterbalancing this on the other side, is the Catholic Church's teaching on the virtue of Temperance in this regard. We all know the church is fearful of excessive drink — too fearful indeed, the children would in houses turned into hell on earth by drunken parents. And we all know of fine young boys and girls whose lives were ruined because of drink. Take so many before them — they too were convinced that they could take it or leave it alone anytime they wished. It is to find that once again, they could not stop — ruined lives, brighted futures, unhappy marriages were the result. It is this fact that has prompted many Temperance Societies to complain. What you say is all very well in theory, it sounds together very much on paper, only it simply does not work out in fact, you are not taking a realistic view of life.

The fact of the matter of course, is just the opposite. The Catholic Church worries no words about excessive drinking. She says very plainly to the whole world that no one has the right to get drunk — ever, not even once in a while a year or once or twice a lifetime for that matter. Drunkenness is a mortal sin, even if a person does not become drunk, he does sin if he drinks immoderately. He lessens his sense of responsibility and puts himself in danger of drunkenness and many other evils, especially impurity. It is for that reason that the Catholic Church advises her children against drink. She tells her members that they would be far better off if they never drank. Today, in the Province of Quebec, there are hundreds of thousands of young people who have taken a promise to abstain from alcoholic drink altogether. They have done this at the urging of the Church. Such has ever been her stand, especially with young people, and such it will ever be.

CONCLUSION

But through it all, the Church keeps her head. She will not allow herself to be stampeded into violating a right, in order to overcome a misuse of that right. For she works on principle and not on expediency. Virtue does the same. So, drink if you wish, but drink moderately. If you cannot do that, then you have no right to drink at all.

God Bless You.

QUESTION

HOW OFTEN IS IT NECESSARY TO HAVE BENEDICTION IN A PARISH CHURCH?

ANSWER

As far as I know it is never necessary to have Benediction, except in so far as each parish usually has Eucharistic processions during the year as well as the Forty Hours Devotion prescribed by the bishop where this is possible. You see, Benediction is not an official, liturgical service in the Catholic Church, like Mass is. You must have Mass; you do not have to have Benediction. Though you'll find that wherever a priest is available and people are present every parish will try to have Benediction as often as the Bishop permits, because Benediction is one of the warmest and most beautiful services in the Catholic Church.

QUESTION

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ROMAN CATHOLICS AND GREEK CATHOLICS? IS HOLY COMMUNION THE SAME FOR BOTH? IS THE MASS THE SAME? WHAT ABOUT CONFESSION?

ANSWER.

We have answered this question before, but for some reason, it keeps coming up every now and then. The Catholic Church is that world-wide body of the faithful, made up of over 400 million people all over the globe, who, believe the same Faith, have the same worship and sacraments and are subject to and in communion with the one universal head of the Church of God, the bishop of Rome, Successor to St. Peter and Vicar of Christ on earth — who at present, happens to be Pope Pius XII. Now, within the Church, the overwhelming majority of the faithful belong to what is known as the Latin or Western rite of the Church. The remainder of the faithful, about 8 million of them, belong to the Oriental or Eastern rites of the Catholic Church. The word rite simply means the form and language of the ceremonies and prayers used during Mass and other Church functions as well as laws and customs. There are 18 different Oriental or Eastern "rites", the

Armenian, Syrian, Coptic, Ukrainian and so on. But all the members of these rites are Catholics just as much as we are, because like us, they believe the same Catholic Faith, they have the same Mass and Seven Sacraments and like ourselves, are in communion with and subject to the head of the Church on earth, the pope. That is what makes them Catholics, just as it makes us Catholics.

Their Mass is essentially the same as ours. They offer up to God the Real Body and Blood of Christ, even as we do. Their ceremonies, language and vestments, while different from ours, are very beautiful. If you have ever assisted at Mass in a Ukrainian Catholic Church, for example, you cannot have helped but marvel at the beauty and majesty of it all.

As far as Holy Communion is concerned, it is the same as ours, of course. Only, they receive Our Lord's Body and Blood under the appearance of both bread and wine, whereas in the Latin rite, we receive Holy Communion only under the appearance of bread. This, as you know, is only a matter of convenience, for the Catholic Church has always taught that Holy Communion may be received under either or both forms, since you cannot divide the Living Christ.

Finally, Confession is also the same in both cases. It is the same sacrament of penance and the same essential conditions and requirements apply in both cases. The laws and customs of Eastern rites differ in many respects from those of the Latin rite, but in the main they are the same. To sum up: If you travel much, you will soon see how wonderfully this basic law of the Catholic Church works out around the world. In all essential things, unity; in non-essential things, liberty; in all things, charity.

RADIO BROADCAST

I.

"The Catholic Church on Gambling."

Dear Radio Friends:

One of the things closely connected with all forms of recreation is the business of gambling. Whether it is horse races or sweepstakes, or basketball tournaments or any other form of sport or recreation, the fact is that hundreds of millions of dollars change hands in the course of each year through gambling. Now a great many people feel very strongly about this. And, as always, you have both extremes of the question well represented and very close about it. On the one hand you have the professional gamblers who make a business out of the process of separating a man from his money. And by way of violent reaction to the heartless cruelty of humane professional gambling, you have those who would rule out not all forms of gambling as sinful in themselves for everyone.

There is a Catholic attitude on this entire question of gambling and it is based on certain principles that help keep the proper balance of sane judgment in the matter. The first rule of thumb is this: "What may be perfectly all right in itself under certain circumstances may become all wrong under other circumstances." Some things that are not wrong in themselves may nevertheless be in conflict with the civil law. In that case the civil laws of the state are to be observed. Finally, there are things which in the nature are opposed to no law whatsoever but nevertheless should not be done. Because they offend against what we call the "littleness" of things. Or as St. Paul put it: "All things are lawful for me but not all things are expedient." (1 Cor. 6:12)

A. THE CATHOLIC ATTITUDE ON GAMBLING:

Now let's apply that to gambling. Gambling means "To play or to game for money or other stakes, to hazard or to wager." This applies to all forms of gambling, whether it be betting, games of

choose between, certain forms of abstention in playing the stock market.

Take the first principle namely that gambling can be lawful under certain conditions and unlawful under others. For example you can bet about something that is good or worthless. You can make bets about a football match, you can bet about something wrong, to go and come out a wash. For example. Furthermore, the bet need be honest or dishonest, fair or unfair, or honest or dishonest and fair. I can bet on a football match where the odds are laid on the basis of something that is established and proven, that is, if a bet would be wrong, I must come to pay out a large sum, but I am able to pay up if he loses and pay up with money that he is entitled to use not with money that he borrowed through the efforts of his talents. The money he needs to support his claims.

Therefore if a man wants to make an honest wage among friends that he has no objection. We all know that betting has elements of danger and it and can lead to evil consequences. But that matter can drive strategies and governments. But the danger element in betting is not sufficient cause to forbid it to people who have enough sense to keep it within the bounds of moderation. And let me not pretend that there are not such people. There are a small number of them.

But now professional gambling, however, is another matter. To professional gamblers betting is no small affair indulged in for the sake of momentary recreation. Professional gambling is a serious business and they're in it for money, profit and nothing but. Therefore they encourage the desire to get something for nothing beyond the bounds of all reason. They goad that desire to the point where it becomes an all-consuming passion and drives a man to bet his last cent whether he can afford it or not. That kind of gambling, evidently, is immoral. There is nothing so heinous as professional gambling.

The second principle that applies here I have already mentioned in the beginning of this talk. What may not be immoral in itself may nevertheless conflict with the good laws of the land. In that case the just law of the land must be observed. Some cities in previous times forbid all betting and correspondence because of the danger of wholesale fraud and abuse. The purpose of such a law is to protect the citizen from being outwitted. Such a law is to be observed.

Finally we said that certain things all right in themselves, are not always expedient on the ground of betting. There is nothing wrong whatever in the average small bet, the games of

chance at bazars and so on, that lodges, fraternities and church organizations conduct to raise money for charitable purposes. If they begin to grow too big, however, then they offend against the fittingness of the whole affair and are no longer expedient. This happened recently in Montreal when Archbishop Leger stopped all church bingos on the ground that they were growing too big and involved. Which was a perfectly proper move.

In general, however, the ordinary bingos, games of chance and so on carried on under church auspices are eminently sensible in their size and manner of operation and it seems to me that only a warped conscience can be scandalized at them and all such harmless pleasures useful. To pretend as some have that the occasional wage to get something for nothing leads to a shiftless mode of life in general, is an exaggeration that demonstrates itself by the very extravagance of the charge.

Therefore, to sum up

Gambling is an indifferent action in itself. It is neither good nor bad. It is certainly permissible as a legitimate pleasure when it is indulged in moderately, honestly and with stakes that a person can afford to lose. It becomes immoral if indulged in to a degree where it becomes a consuming passion or if the money that is risked rightfully belongs to someone else, such as a man's family and so on. As an afterthought, but it is strange that some people who inveigh mightily against a simple game of chance for the sake of honest recreation, are often the very ones who will then turn around and acclaim the making of thousands and even millions in a stock market gamble as legitimate business. The bingo player is condemned as something of a parasite while the stock market speculator is hailed as a captain of industry. Truly, there is no accounting for the way some people reason!

What, then, is the truth and what rule can a person follow? This one: You have a perfect right to gamble if you can do so moderately and with money that you can afford to lose. If you cannot gamble that way, then you have no right to gamble at all.

B. THE CATHOLIC ATTITUDE ON CARDS AND DANCING

Before we close out this subject I should like to add a word about card playing and dancing. Here again, some people entertain very strange notions about these things. I have seen leaflets condemning all card-playing and dancing as sinful, worldly pleasures

that are really instruments of the devil to drag people to hell. I have even seen Scripture quoted in support of this stand. Well, what's the answer? For one thing, it might be well, if the Bible were quoted correctly to begin with. What is condemned, especially in I Pet. 4th chapter is not the moderate use of innocent pleasure, but — and here are the words of St. Peter — lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revelings, banquetings and abominable idolatries — hardly a description of an ordinary game of cards or of the average dancer.

What then is the truth about card-playing and dancing? The same as for any other innocent pleasure. If it can be done moderately, honestly and as a form of recreation it is perfectly all right. On the other hand, if a person were to play cards dishonestly, or to play to such an extent that his work or duties suffered from neglect, then, evidently, it would be wrong. But let us not confuse the abuse of a pleasure with its legitimate use!

In judging dancing, however, one has to be a little more careful. Dancing as such is simply the graceful movement of the body in rhythm. It can be perfectly good. In fact, in the Old Testament, we find that dancing was sometimes performed to glorify God. And in Spain, even today, certain graceful folk dances are performed during processions of the Blessed Sacrament. These dances are good.

All too many of our modern dances, however, are not good. They are more an outlet for unrestrained passion than an exhibition of graceful movement. Some, because of the proximity of bodies, are a positive inducement to sin. Such dances, it goes without saying, are sinful and therefore forbidden.

CONCLUSION:

To gambling, card-playing and dancing, therefore, the same general principles apply. Moderation, honesty and decency. Let everyone remember this and no one will be tempted to abuse the pleasures God meant to brighten this life we lead here below.

God Bless You.

QUESTION BOX.

5.

"WHERE AND WHEN DID THE CUSTOM OF HAVING A CHRISTMAS CRIB ORIGINATE?"

ANSWER.

What knowledge of the crib or manger in which the Christ-Child was laid, goes right back to the beginning, it was left to St. Francis of Assisi to popularize it and give it the tangible form in which we know it today. In 1223, while on a visit to Rome, he confided to Pope Honorius III, his plans of making a scenic representation of the place of the Nativity. The pope gladly gave his blessing and permission to the project and Francis, on his return to Greccio on Christmas Eve, constructed a crib and grouped around it the figures of the Blessed Virgin and St. Joseph, the ass and the ox as well as the shepherds who came to adore the new-born Saviour. Ever since that time, the crib has become ever more popular and is now a beloved part of the Christmas scene.

QUESTION

"IS A PERSON EXEMPT FROM PAYING HIS DEBTS IF HE IS UNABLE TO DO SO?"

ANSWER.

As long as a person is truly unable to pay his debts, the obligation to do so is suspended. It is never abolished. As soon as the debtor is able to pay his debts, he must then do so, even if it is years after.

QUESTION

"WHY DO YOU CALL THE POPE 'YOUR HOLINESS' AND 'HOLY FATHER' SCRIPTURE SAYS ONLY GOD IS HOLY IS THERE SOMETHING SUPERNATURAL ABOUT THE POPE?"

ANSWER.

We call the pope 'Holy Father' and 'Your Holiness' because of the dignity of his office just as we call the king "Your Majesty," and the Mayor, "Your Worship." These titles refer to the office these men hold and not necessarily to them as men at all. The pope is not supernatural at all. In himself he is only a man like anyone else. But the office he holds is supernatural. It was established by Christ when He said to St. Peter "Thou art Peter and upon this rock, I will build my church." (Matt. 16: 18) "Feed my lambs; feed my sheep" (John 21: 17).

RADIO BROADCAST

4.

"The Catholic Church on Literature and Movies."

Dear Radio Friends:

A few weeks ago, listener sent in a question asking why the Church forbids Catholics to read certain books. Our questioner stated that he believed in the absolute freedom of the mind. He believed that everyone had the right to read anything he wished, to consider all sides of a disputed question and then form his own judgment on the matter. The essential point of the answer was given him when his question was answered. Tonight I want to expand on that and give you the principles upon which the Catholic attitude is based. I think you will agree they are grounded in the soundest of common sense.

A. THE CATHOLIC ATTITUDE TOWARDS LITERATURE.

Consider the question of books. If there be a God and He created Man with an immortal soul made to the image and likeness of God and destined moreover, to be eternally happy with Him in heaven. If this be so, then no man on earth has the right to say anything, to read anything or to do anything that can endanger the end and purpose for which God made him. That a Supreme Being, a Creator of all things including Man, does exist, can be proved from cold reason alone. And therefore, the rest follows step by step.

What about books, then, the point with which we are concerned tonight? There are good books and bad books. The Catholic Church urges her children and all men for that matter, to read morally good books. She absolutely forbids them under pain of mortal sin to read morally bad books. Which books are bad? Those, first of all, that constitute a temptation to men to lead lives contrary to the way God told men to lead their lives. This is particularly true with regard to books that pervert the true meaning of sex. Thou shalt not commit adultery is one of the 10 Commandments. Our

and the Truth He revealed to men. These books attack the existence of God, for example; others try to undermine the moral law still others set out to show that all is agony or nothing but a hold-over from the pagan myth. Now, anyone trained in philosophy and theology can do this, with such books. He can spot the gaps and holes in the arguments immediately, but the average person cannot. Only the other he is frightened by the author's very name and if there be any point in the writing, a sparkling wit or dashing verse or style. The poor man sits there with eyes straggling and mouth agape and watches a whole lot of facts blotted out of his mind by seemingly reasonable arguments which when one reflects are poured on the good measure. Is it any wonder that the Church forbids her children to read such books. The average Catholic could not begin to cope with such a book, a trained theologian would make more meat out of it. To me, an example, A clever but dishonest lawyer can talk rings around the average man in the street, not because his arguments are good or unassailable. They are not. But with his legal training, he knows the tricks of the trade and in a debate in court, he works the average man up in knots. It would take an honest man with a trained legal mind to bring out the flaws and weak spots in the late argument and demolish it. The same holds true for books that attack religion or morality. That is why the Church forbids the average Catholic to read the sort of his parish, through reading books he is not mentally equipped to answer. That is not being afraid Catholics will find out the truth, as some people like to put it on. That's nonsense. It is simply the same prudence of a man who is not foolhardy enough to step into court against a dishonest lawyer, the prudence of someone of us that would keep us from stepping into the ring with Joe Louis, no matter how old he is. We have such matters to people who can take care of them, just as Catholics have forbidden books to those who can handle them with dispatch.

B. THE CATHOLIC ATTITUDE TOWARDS MOVIES:

As far as movies are concerned, the same principles apply. Catholics like anyone else may see a morally good movie. Catholics, like anyone else, are forbidden to go to movies that try to justify suicide or murder, that attack the sanctity and permanence of marriage or that are just plain dirty from the standpoint of sex. Just as a picture is worth a thousand words, so a bad movie can be as

Insidiously more dangerous to a person's soul than a bad book. Indecent dress, double-meaning jokes and dialogue, suggestive situations, downright immoral plots—all add up to a result that is very real. And people, especially youngsters and teenagers, being impressionable, are often so dazzled by the ravishing physical beauty of the actress or the dashing derring-do of that handsome devil the hero, that they forget that what these two are doing on the screen is nothing but pure adultery—a sin. And no one with the slightest knowledge of human psychology will pretend that the movie goes leave the theatre without having had some impression made on their minds, especially in the case of the young.

So bad did the movies become in the early thirties, that the Catholic Church was forced to do something about it to protect her children from the dirt coming out of Hollywood. The Legion of Decency was formed to classify pictures into Good, Objectionable in Part and Condemned. The rule to follow is this: 1) Anyone may go to a morally good movie. 2) Anyone who deliberately goes to a condemned movie, knowing that it is condemned, commits a mortal sin. 3) A person would moreover commit a mortal sin by attending a B-movie that constituted for him a presumptive occasion of grave sin, or if by attending, he were to give grave scandal to others.

A member scandal does not mean shocking people. It means leading weaker souls by your example into sin. So stay away from B-movies, if you want to be a decent person. Usually your pastor will have a listing of shows in the vestibule of your parish church, for your convenience.

CONCLUSION.

To sum up: Both books and movies can be tremendous forces for good. They can also be tremendous forces for evil. Read good books and go to good movies if you wish. But don't defile your soul with anything wicked. And keep a good eye on that Lord's words.

Blessed are the pure of heart, for they shall see God. Matt. 5: 8.

God Bless You

J. M. J. A. M.

FEB. 9th, 1942

QUESTION BOX.

QUESTION

"WHY DO YOU CALL ROME THE ETERNAL CITY? THE BIBLE SAYS THAT THE HOLY CITY THE NEW JERUSALEM WHICH COMES DOWN FROM HEAVEN IS

THE ETERNAL CITY

ANSWER:

Actually the Bible does not refer to the New Jerusalem as the Eternal city. However, that's a minor point. To answer your question Rome is called the Eternal City because of its long history which goes back over 2 centuries before the coming of Christ. Actually there is nothing whatever eternal in the strict sense about Rome. It was built in 752 B.C. so it had a beginning. And it could be destroyed tomorrow if war broke out. So the term Eternal City as applied to Rome is simply a popular name accepted by civilization because of Rome's long history. It is much the same, I suppose, as our custom of calling Chicago the Windy City and Saskatoon the Hub City.

QUESTION

"WHY DO YOU JUST MENTION THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AS SUCH IN YOUR ADDRESSES WHEN WE ALL KNOW YOU BELONG TO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH WITH THE POPE OF ROME AS THE HOLY FATHER OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH?"

ANSWER:

We answered that question a couple of years ago, if I remember rightly. However it won't do any harm to repeat the answer. Jesus Christ founded only one Church, His Church. He did not call it the Catholic Church. It was St. Ignatius of Antioch who, about the year 110 A.D. first called the Universal Church Christ founded, the Catholic Church because the word Catholic means universal. So, there is only one Catholic Church, the one that is under the Pope, the successor of St. Peter, the same as it always was right back through history. Today, all kinds of people like to call themselves Catholics. That is what caused the Reformers back in 17th century England to coin the term "Roman Catholic", to give the impression that there were other Catholics besides those who were in communion with the Pope. That little subtlety, however, has never fooled anyone and even to this day the use of the term "Roman Catholic" is, for the most part, confined to the English speaking countries where it was invented three centuries ago. And even there no one is deceived. You have only to go to any strange city in Canada, England or the United States and ask for the nearest Catholic church and there is no doubt whatever as to which church you will be directed.

RADIO BROADCAST

I

"The Catholic Church on Mercy-Killing."

Dear Radio Friends

Last year 329 non-Catholic clergymen in the United States demanded of the New York state legislature, a law permitting voluntary mercy-killing under careful safeguards. In 1947, 1000 New York Physicians had made a similar petition. In their plea which was sponsored by the Euthanasia Society of America, the clergymen said that they no longer believed that God wills the prolongation of physical torture for the benefit of the soul of the sufferer. They added "For one enduring continual and severe pain from an incurable disease who is a burden to himself and his family, surely he has no value. We believe such a sufferer has the right to die and society should grant this right, showing the same mercy to human beings as to the sub-human animal kingdom. The clergymen concluded by saying that the safeguards should include a petition signed by the sufferer himself and agreed to by his physician, the appointment of a committee of physicians to investigate the case and if the committee approved the final ordering of the mercy-killing by a court of record.

A. THE PRINCIPLES INVOLVED

Perhaps it was the cold-blooded gruseness of the whole affair that evoked such a roar of protest from the rest of society. With few exceptions, newspapers, medical men and the public conscience is revolted at the ghastly proposal. Tonight, however, I am not interested in the new emotional reaction. I want to show you on what principles the Catholic Church condemns this business of so-called "mercy"-killing for exactly what it is - murder.

First of all, suppose we consider the principles involved and then in the light of them, we can easily solve the objections that are offered by the mercy-killers. To begin with, mercy-killing is either

right or wrong. If it is right, it can be done. If it is wrong, it can never be done. Now, not only the Catholic Church, but the conscience of mankind has always condemned men's taking as wrong. What? Basically, fundamentally and eternally, it is wrong for the reason God and God alone is the Author, Owner and Finisher of life. Therefore, for any human being to end his own life - suicide - is a direct violation of God's dominion over that human life. The suicide is guilty of a mortal sin of injustice. If a man or other person, be it doctor or anyone else, deliberately to end a patient's life, is a murderer. It is the unjust taking of innocent life, and as such, it is likewise a mortal sin of injustice against God's ownership of that life. It is as simple as that.

The reasoning, of course, is clear. No man gives himself life. To do so, he would have had to exist beforehand in order to create himself, which is patent nonsense. Therefore, since he did not give himself life, it is not his to take away. Nor are a man's parents the authors of his life. For they themselves depended on their parents, and merely passed on the life that was in them. And even then, they were only instruments cooperating with God. They created the bodies of their children, but it was God who gave those bodies life when He created. As I said. No matter how you look at it, everything always goes back to God, the ultimate Author and Owner of all life, human as well as animal and vegetable. As far as animal and vegetable life are concerned, God gave men dominion over them when, as the Bible tells us, He made Man the lord of creation and destined all other forms of life to serve Man.

But is Himself alone, God reserved the full and direct power over the life of men. As if human reason were not enough to show this, Scripture confirms it and does so with a very definite finality. In the Book of Deuteronomy, 2nd Chapter, 19th verse, God says plainly: "I will kill and I will make to live." In the 16th chapter of Wisdom, we read: "It is thou, O Lord, that hast power over life and death." And as it, that was not plain enough, God told the Jews in the 23rd Chapter of Exodus: "The innocent and the just, thou shalt not kill." Finally when God gave Moses the 10 Commandments, He said:

"Thou shalt not kill." He did not add, except when people are suffering and have no hope of recovery. Men, therefore, may do all in their power to relieve suffering and to deaden pain, but they may not take innocent life for God has given them no authority to do so.

I realize, of course, that all this means nothing to an atheist or

a martyrdom. He believes neither in God, nor in the human soul, nor in the place of suffering in the Christian plan of life. The only way to talk to him is to show him that mercy killing is nothing but a throw back to barbarism. But how any person who claims to believe in God and in Christianity can argue against the plain words of Scripture is beyond me. Next, a person hasn't a moral leg to stand on. God and God alone is the Center of human life.

There are many other reasons that concern this mercy killing and while they always remain secondary to God's unchangeable right over life and death, they carry definite weight. For example, doctors themselves are the ones who point to the continual progress medical science is making in the control of disease and pain. I could quote various moral authorities on this point alone. At a congress of physicians in Edinburgh two years ago a Dr. Gordon told the assembly:

The infallibility of physicians is not such as to warrant bestowing upon them the right of life and death. The idea of an omniscient doctor is intolerable to any physician worthy of the name. And a Dr. Alexander J. P. Cameron in a special address on euthanasia was flatter:

From the purely medical point of view, the right of taking the life of a patient for the relief of pain is unnecessary. Moreover, it is a confession of professional failure or ignorance. If you add to this the violation of the Hippocratic Oath that all doctors take on entering upon the practice of medicine, as well as the resultant loss of confidence in the part of patients in doctors, should mercy killing be come prevalent you have an excellent argument against it from the medical standpoint alone.

Finally, even from the legal standpoint, mercy killing is intolerable. To begin with, since God alone has given man over human life, we have no right whatever to give the State power to say when an innocent person shall die. Even if given, such authority would be invalid. But there is more. You see those advocating this mercy killing are content right well to insist on a "voluntary" situation that is where the sufferer himself requests death. But they make no effort to conceal the fact that the entire mercy killing program would eventually call for the compulsory elimination of the hopelessly crippled, the incurable, the insane and worn — all the way from an infantile child to the habitually criminal. In other words, they are caught by their own lantern and would soon reach into almost every area of human life. It is for these as well as a veritable host of other reasons that not only the Catholic Church, but the conscience of

manhood has always rejected this particularly ugly kind of murder.

B. OBJECTIONS ANSWERED:

There are several objections raised by the mercy killers. Here are the main ones and they are easily answered. There is, for example, the old one that if God's dominion over life prevents us from shortening it by the same token we have no right to strengthen or preserve it either. That is no case at all. If a person going away on a journey gives you a pot of grease to keep for him until he returns, he expects you to water it and keep it safe until he comes back to claim it. He certainly does not give you the right to destroy it. Just as certainly he does mean for it to be preserved and to preserve it. Life is like that. God gives it to us in trust. It means us to keep it and preserve it with undeviating care until such time as He calls us to death. In support of this, we have only to turn to the New Testament. Our Lord raised the dead to life, gave sight to the blind, healed lepers and Himself accepted the agony of the cross. Nowhere do we read that He killed himself to avoid suffering. So there is adequate argument favoring the doctor's healing work. It is a matter to put by the evil of murder to avoid pain.

Sometimes the early martyrs and heroes in battle who walked to certain death, are quoted in favour of mercy killing. It is a pity, the mercy killers cannot distinguish between willing a thing directly and willing it only indirectly. There is a whole moral world of difference between simply permitting an unavoidable evil effect as the by-product of a good action, and wanting that evil effect either in itself or as a means to something else. The first is all right, the second is all wrong. The martyrs neither sought death directly as an end in itself nor directly as a means to anything else. What they did seek was to stay loyal to Jesus Christ and if they had to submit to death to do it, they were willing to suffer it as an unavoidable by-product of their supreme act of faith. There is no comparison whatever here with mercy killing.

Then there is the objection that says that since a doctor is pledged to relieve suffering and pain, then mercy killing is justified. The answer is simple. The doctor's obligation to relieve suffering can extend only to moral means which are in accord with the law of God. A doctor certainly cannot be obliged to do evil and take innocent life to accomplish some good, even the relief of pain. The doctor like anyone else is positively obliged not to do evil that good may result. A

good end, never justifies the use of morally evil means to attain it.

Finally, there are those who try to justify mercy-killing by saying that if God's commandment "Thou shalt not kill" holds good, then what about capital punishment or the killing of someone in self-defense be it in peace or war? The answer again is clear. All these are cases of unjust aggressors who are not innocent, and Scripture covers such cases ample. On the other hand the person who is simply suffering grievous pain is guilty of no crime, except the 'crime' of being sick. He is absolutely innocent and as Scripture says: "The innocent and the just thou shalt not kill" (Exod. 23:7).

CONCLUSION

It is encouraging to note how the overwhelming majority of doctors instinctively rose against the mercy-killers. The entire board of delegates representing 7,000 doctors in New York state, voted unanimously against it. The World Medical Association representing 41 nations, condemned it outright. The memory of what a paginated medical profession did in Germany under Hitler is still a pretty vivid and ghastly thing for most of us. What is needed then, is not a godless sterilized, 'survivors of the fittest'. That would be a return to the law of the jungle. What the measurably sick and crippled and insane ask of us is a Christlike human compassion. God forbid that we should ever show them anything less.

God Bless You.

J. M. J. A. M.

JAN, 1968, 1952

QUESTION BOX.

7

QUESTION

PLEASE TELL US WHETHER OR NOT IT IS AGAINST CHURCH LAWS TO GO TO DANCES DURING ADVENT OR LENT

ANSWER

Both Advent and Lent are seasons of prayer and penance. Advent in preparation for Christmas and Lent for Easter. All year long, the Church urges us to do penance for our sins, but especially during Advent and Lent. During these two seasons, the Church makes certain

laws regarding fast and abstinence from meat. These laws bind under pain of mortal sin unless one is excused or unpeccated from them. For the rest, the Church makes no general law for all the faithful. Therefore to answer your question about dancing, a distinction must be made. Catholics of the Latin or Roman rite are not forbidden to dance, although they would do well to avoid them, at least all public dances. For Lent and Advent are times of penance. However, there is no Church law forbidding Catholics of the Latin rite to dance. Catholics of the Ukrainian or Oriental rite, however, are forbidden by Church law, and under pain of mortal sin, to dance during Advent or Lent. This law happens to be one of the serious laws for Ukrainian Catholics, just as abstaining from meat on Friday happens to be one of the serious laws for Latin rite Catholics. The different rites simply have different laws, that's all. So, Ukrainian Catholics you are forbidden to go to dances during Advent or Lent and you are forbidden under pain of mortal sin. Latin Catholics you should abstain from dances during these two seasons, at least from all public dances though the law does not bind you as it does Ukrainian Catholics.

QUESTION

DO THE WORDS 'DISCIPLE' and 'APOSTLE' AS USED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT MEAN THE SAME THING?

ANSWER

Not exactly. Among all the people who listened to and followed Our Lord, 72 called disciples, were especially chosen to go before Him into every town. Among these, He handpicked a further group of twelve men, whom the Bible calls 'Apostles'. Saints Matthew, Mark and Luke in their Gospels, all give the names of these specially-chosen Twelve, always beginning, of course, with St. Peter — Peter, James, John, Bartholomew — and so on. So, while all the Apostles were certainly Disciples, not all the Disciples were Apostles. Only these Twelve were chosen to form the inner cabinet, as it were, of Christ's Church with St. Peter at the head. These Twelve were destined to be the first bishops of the Church, the 'fishers of men' as Our Lord called them. To them especially, Our Lord said: 'He who hears you, hears me' (Luke 10:16). The word 'Apostle' means 'one who is sent', the word 'Disciple' means 'one who is taught'.

RADIO BROADCAST



The Catholic Church on Marriage."

Dear Radio Friends:

Two years ago I spoke to you on the surpassing beauty of Christian marriage as a sacrament. At the time I tried to show you that marriage was no mere man-made contract between two human beings, to be entered into and broken at will by the contracting parties, but rather that marriage between a Christian man and woman was a life-long union, consecrated in holiness by God Himself and born anew in Christ in all the supernatural beauty and heightened dignity of a Christian sacrament of grace.

I might not have time to go over all that again, however beautiful it may be. We shall have to be content to recall in passing, that the primary end and purpose of marriage etc. remains what God meant it to be, namely, the begetting, the birth and the education of children. Let us never forget that. Among all the blessing of marriage, the child heads the first place, and indeed the Creator Himself who, in His goodness wished to use men as His helpers in the propagation of life, taught this when instituting marriage in Paradise. He said to our first parents and through them to all future spouses: Increase and multiply and fill the earth. (Gen. 1:28) Casti Connubii! Second in importance among the remaining purposes of marriage is that most beautiful and life-giving love a man and a woman can have for each other in the companionship of a life-long union. And finally, in marriage men and women were meant by God to realize the legitimate satisfaction of sexual desire.

Tonight however will you allow me to dwell on two other great aspects of marriage. I would like to do so because it seems to me that not only are these vital aspects too often forgotten, but by the same token, if the realization of their profound significance ever dawned on married couples, it would deepen and enrich their whole attitude towards their marriage. What are these two aspects?

A. SANCTIFICATION OF THE SPOUSE.

The first is this: Marriage was meant by God to be the means whereby husband and wife sanctify each other. They are to use their marriage to make each other saints. Let us see what that means. Young people today are wonderfully sensible. Boys and girls in their teens and early twenties may seem to be all taken up with the froth and bubbles of youth—dancing, parties and just plain having a good time. But don't let it fool you. I am convinced that today, as always, young people have a wonderful fund of deep common sense underneath. Not a single moment are the majority of them ever fooled into thinking that marriage is only a matter of white satin and tulle and rings, flowers and showers. They know with a wisdom beyond their years that that is only the icing on the cake that the real substance of marriage means living, sleeping, eating with one person day in and day out for the rest of their mortal lives. Young people, I believe, know that and think about it deeply and for that abiding soundness of judgment I salute them.

But now go higher. I wonder how many of you married people, especially husbands and above all Catholics—I just wonder, I try, how many of you ever stop to re-evaluate your marriage in this higher and solemn light, namely that this whole business of living, sleeping, eating together, and raising a family is the way material God means you to use day by day to make each other saints. How many of you husbands and wives sitting around your radio tonight can look at each other and say, "I married you because I love you and with God's help, I want to be there about our marriage and in the union of our bodies, hearts and souls, so to get that I will sanctify you— you, my husband, you, my wife—and help you to save your soul and get to heaven. How many of you have ever thought of your marriage that way? I'm afraid not too many. Maybe I'm wrong about this, but it does seem to me that a lot more married people have what you might call a terrible small and stunted and humdrum view of their marriage. As though they had said to themselves, "Well, marriage seems to be just the normal way to live out your life down here on earth, that's all. Everyone else seems to get married, so I suppose we ought as well too. You ought almost say that they seem to drift into marriage and it never seems to dawn on them what a sublime thing God meant it to be in terms of their soul's salvation.

2. MARRIAGE IS SOCIAL, NOT PRIVATE

The other most meaningful aspect of marriage is this. Marriage, contrary to popular thought, is not a private affair between two people. It is put about the most public of public affairs and God instituted marriage not for the private enjoyment and selfish pursuit of two people living out their own little lives in their own little world. God instituted marriage that each new generation of children might be born into the world for the good of society as a whole. And it is only when husbands and wives see this clearly and hold God's plan as He meant it to be fulfilled, that they have the right to the pleasures and privileges of married life.

It is precisely because this divine order of things has not only been abused but actually turned around that you have the evil of both perverts. Those who practice this mortal sin, have simply inverted the Divine plan God had in mind when He instituted marriage. They have put the pleasure and privileges of marriage in the first place of importance and made the begetting of children only secondary. So that if having children becomes a nuisance and a bother for financial or any other reason, why just stop having children, that's all. But keep on enjoying the privileges of marriage they say. In other words, marriage has become in their minds, a nice respectable cover-up for the unbridled satisfaction of passion. "We are married," they say, "so that makes it all right."

God help married people if they ever get themselves into that frame of mind. Because then, their whole idea of marriage can be summed up in one word, selfishness. That is where you will hear them say, "Well, I don't care. What we do in our married life is nobody's business but our own." Oh! is it? Dear Friend, it is very much God's business, and He has laid down some pretty definite laws about how He wants you to use your marriage. Wouldn't it be a terrible and a tragic thing, if at the end of your married lives, the fearful truth were to dawn on you two in eternity that instead of using your marriage to make each other saints, you had used it only to debauch and defile your souls and encourage their damnation?

CONCLUSION

Dear Friends, one of the most beautiful passages in Holy Scripture is the place where St. Paul compares the marriage of a Christian man and woman to the pure, all holy union between Christ and the Church. "Husbands," he says to the Ephesians, "Love your wives as

Christ also loved the Church and delivered Himself for her, that He might sanctify her, cleansing her in the bath of water by means of the word, in order that he might present to Himself the Church in all her glory, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that she might be holy and without blemish. Even thus ought husbands to love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his own wife, loves himself. This is a great mystery. I mean in reference to Christ and to the Church. However, let each one of you also love his wife as he loves himself, and let the wife respect her husband' (Eph. 5: 24-33)

That, Christian husbands and wives, is what your marriage can be. And that, with God's help, is what you can make it.

God Bless You

J. M. J. A. M.

JAN 23rd, 1952

QUESTION BOX.

8

QUESTION

"WHY DO YOU CONFESS YOUR SINS TO THE PRIEST? FOR IF YOU REALLY FEEL SORRY FOR THEM AND CONFESS THEM TO GOD, YOU CAN FEEL IT IN YOUR HEART THAT THE LORD HAS FORGIVEN THEM ISN'T THAT TRUE?"

ANSWER

I think I know what you mean. But it is not the answer. True, emotion or feeling does have its place in religion, but it is a very minor place. And no heresy has brought more unmerited scorn and denision on true religion than this business of making religion practically identical with a pious, interior feeling. Religion is basically a matter of fact, not feeling. God does or does not exist, regardless of how you and I feel about it. Your sins are either forgiven or not forgiven, regardless of whether you "feel" they are or not.

Now, your question: The one thing all of us must decide is this: Shall we have our sins forgiven the way we want them forgiven, or the way God wants them forgiven? Of course, it would be much easier on our proud human nature not to have to confess our sins to a priest. It would be much easier and simpler to confess them privately to God.

in the mystery of our own heart. That's the way we'd all like to do it but that is our way. And it is not the way God wants us to work his government. How do we know that? Well, look up verses 14th and 15th chapters of St. Matthew where Our Lord gave the Apostles the power to bind and loose even with regard to Heaven. And just as well there is an account about it look up the 14th chapters of St. John's Gospel, 13 and 14. There we can find the way God wants us to work his government for us now. When He did not have to do it at all. He didn't do it. He gave the Apostles the power to forgive sins in His name and told them to do so. Because of the Holy Ghost. He said,

Whom ever you shall forgive, they are forgiven them and whom ever you do not forgive they are retained. Now there are other texts in the Bible that were taken that were misused, not was primarily to bind but when you quote from people don't forget to quote them against them too. I have just quoted. I know many people do not that they quote some other text to say that the men don't about confession and those deliberately ignore them. Why then did Our Lord give the Apostles and their successors from the age the power to forgive sins in His name? Was it just another bit of magic in the robe to make themselves good to puff them up and give them power over their brethren's soul for the sake of power and were done that. Every thing He does is for a definite purpose. If people did not have to go to confession to have their sins forgiven through them then what was the point of Our giving the Apostles the power in the first place? You have never to remind the people of what had happened down the centuries to come and here a heretic of many ages earlier about St. Augustine was known answered your difficulty was back in the fourth century. He said in a brief Human nature being what it is do not think that the first Christians would be a good reason for the Apostles and their successors if they did not have to. "What then?" he asks. "Christ's command to the Apostles to forgive sins in His name" and to be faithful to it as a divine power unless the act of forgiving brought its benefit to someone. "Christ would never put us to do things the way God wants them done and the way we do not know Christ's intention is the divine's constituted means of his saving the soul of all men not only for Catholics but for all men, and that means you, too

Cod Bless You.

RADIO BROADCAST

I.

"The Catholic Church on Mixed Marriages."

Dear Friends

The most beautiful human relationship here on earth, it seems to me, is the perfect union that can exist between a man and a woman in marriage. Wouldn't it be a wonderful thing if every marriage were an ideal marriage, if all husbands and wives in their marriage actually attained to that marvelous harmony of two bodies in one flesh, two hearts in one love, two souls perfectly knit in one thought? That you know is the way God meant it to be. A fantastic but married people of this kind are at perfect union in heaven. And it is precisely because Christian marriage can be so wonderful, that I want to speak tonight of the most common obstacle to its fulfillment — a mixed marriage. What is a mixed marriage? As commonly understood, it is a marriage in which husband and wife hold different religious beliefs. More specifically still for our purpose this evening, it is the marriage between a Catholic and a non-Catholic.

Now, I want, as I speak, to plant thoughts about mixed marriages without hurting anybody's feelings. All I can do is ask you to trust me, that what I share with tonight will not be said with any intention of hurting anyone personally. That is the last thing I should want to do. I am aware that some mixed marriages seem to have turned out fairly well. But there weighs in no gaining the fact that the overwhelming majority of them have been the greatest source of unhappiness and heartache to all concerned. So true is this tragic fact, that the Catholic Church, with the earthly happiness and eternal salvation of her children ever in mind, most severely forbids them to marry anyone not of the Faith. Now, let us see why.

A. DIFFICULTIES OF A MIXED MARRIAGE.

Every married person wants his or her marriage to be perfect. When two people walk up the aisle to the altar on their wedding day,

to take each other for better or for worse until death each one of them is taking a tremendous risk. They love each other that's true, but they have no idea what the future holds in store for them. Will they get along together or will they be forever quarrelling? Will they still love each other five, ten, fifty years from now, or will they then wish they had never seen each other. Two couples do not know the cause of their wedding for these things are hidden from their eyes. However if they are both sensible people they will have done every thing possible under God to insure that their future, the same in all the important things of life for how else can they be one, not merely in body but above all in mind and heart. That union of soul that alone can make their marriage happy.

Now for a Catholic a man or a woman's religion, his relations to his God, his fellowmen and to himself in a word his whole outlook on life should be and is the most important thing in life. Hence the problem of a mixed marriage. How can a Catholic and a non-Catholic ever be truly one in mind and heart who from the beginning their minds and hearts are divided on the most important thing in life religion. Now that Catholic who is a Catholic is proud to be and the whole answer to the question nothing or even less than nothing to his non-Catholic partner. Now how that difference of belief runs through a mixed marriage. A Catholic knows that there can never be a divorce from a true marriage. He holds as true on the day of his wedding to prove as true. Death does not part, was but the value of Christ's sacrifice. What God has put together let no man put asunder. Mr. X is. Whereas his non-Catholic partner may and often does believe that before God a divorce with the right to remarry is allowed if they simply cannot make a go of it. Again a Catholic knows he can never seek the pleasure of marriage and at the same time deliberately to do this by not by means he knows to be sinful. His non-Catholic partner may not agree, such means are sinful. Further a Catholic is so much bound to attend Holy Mass on Sundays to abstain from meat on Fridays and to go to confession regularly. To his non-Catholic partner a marriage all this may seem excessive. All this and a hundred other regulations issued or given I understand well I do not ~~understand~~ understand right with proving the Catholic Faith, that can be done anytime. All I want to show you here, are the countless points of conflict that arise in a mixed marriage on the score of religion alone.

Above all, however, it is the children who suffer most in such a

marriage. They love both their father and their mother more than anyone in the world. That being so, how doubly heavy must be the burden on the shoulders of the Catholic parent, in bringing them up in the Faith, when through all those years, the children have the silent argument of the equally loved non-Catholic parent who does not believe that Faith. Torn between a parent who says it is everything and a parent who says it is not, can we wonder that so often, children of mixed marriages end by dropping all religion as just another wrangle that nobody can settle?

That this is only too often so, has ever been the tragic experience of the Catholic Church. And her judgment on the matter is more than borne out by experts in the field of domestic relations. Some months ago, the *Reader's Digest* reported the results of a survey made on this very point by a professor at an American University. Of the hundreds of mixed marriages investigated it was found that in the overwhelming majority of cases, the difference of religion had been the principal source of conflict, and so, for the sake of so-called peace in the family, both Catholic and non-Catholic ended up by not practicing any religion at all. So they had their peace — in this life, anyway.

A. PROMISES SAFEGUARDS:

It is because of this tragic loss among her children, that the Church requires promises and safeguards before any Catholic can validly contract marriage with one not of the Faith. Besides the stipulation that there be only the Catholic ceremony the Church requires of the non-Catholic party: 1) the promise not to interfere with the Catholic's practice of his or her religion. And 2) of both parties, she further requires that they solemnly promise before God, and under oath, the baptism and upbringing of all the children in the Catholic Faith alone. This last promise sometimes causes great bitterness among non-Catholics. Therefore I wish to point out here why the Catholic Church does and must require that promise. If non-Catholics cannot in conscience agree with the Church on this point, that is fine; but by the same token, it can at least be hoped that they in turn, will also be able to see why, with us, it is likewise a matter of conscience.

The Catholic Church does not believe that one church is as good as another. She believes that Jesus Christ gave but one body of truths for all men — what we call "The Faith", that He founded but one Church, His Church, so that with a living, teaching voice, she

might, with authority, give that body of truths to all men till the end of time. She believes that she is that Church and that the Catholic Faith is that Faith. If that be so, then you can see immediately why, in order to be true to her own principles and to her Founder, she could never agree to even one child of a mixed marriage being brought up in any religion other than the Catholic Faith, for she believes that in every other religion, error has crept in and only part of the truth remains. If a non-Catholic cannot in conscience make this promise concerning the children, then let him be true to himself and not make it. No one has to marry a Catholic. But if he does make it, let him know that he is bound to keep it. God forbid that he, any more than a Catholic, should enter marriage with a lie on his lips or in his heart.

CONCLUSION

To sum up. From all this, what conclusion should we draw? Step back, as it were, and take a good look at mixed marriage. Here you have two good and sweet people, wanting with all their hearts to be perfectly united in mind and soul as well as in body, yet doomed to go down the years together with a gulf separating them on the one thing that can make them one in mind and soul—religion. To me, the conclusion is obvious. Do not marry anyone, not of your faith. The Church wants all men to be happy in marriage, not just Catholics, but all men. Let non-Catholics then, marry non-Catholics. All other things being equal, this will be far happier than married to a Catholic. But as for the faithful, let Catholics marry their own. In the Catholic Church marriage is not merely a holy contract, but one raised by Our Lord to the infinite beauty and dignity of a sacrament. Not only have they a community of background and interests, united, as they are, in the bond of the Faith, they have the one thing that can make their marriage what God meant marriage to be, a foretaste of their final and perfect union in heaven.

God Bless You.

QUESTION BOX.

9

QUESTION:

"IN DANGER OF DEATH, COULD A CATHOLIC GO TO CONFESSION TO A CLERGYMAN OTHER THAN A CATHOLIC PRIEST?"

ANSWER:

Only to a Greek Orthodox priest and even then, only in the most extreme necessity. You see, the Greek Orthodox are no longer Catholics, since they broke away from the Catholic Church 900 years ago. But when they did break away back there, they always kept the true idea of the Mass and their bishops and priests have always kept an unbroken line of valid ordinations down the centuries. It is for this reason that a dying Catholic could, in extreme necessity, confess his sins to an Orthodox priest, if a Catholic priest were not available.

QUESTION:

"IF A PERSON IN MORTAL SIN REPENTS BUT CANNOT GET TO CONFESSION, WILL A SINCERE ACT OF CONTRITION SAVE HIM SHOULD HE DIE BEFORE HE CAN GET TO CONFESSION?"

ANSWER:

No sin is ever forgiven without repentance. A person going to confession is presumed to be sorry for his sins, otherwise his confession is no good. If he cannot get to confession, a person dying in mortal sin should make an Act of Perfect Contrition — that is, true sorrow for having offended God, who is so good. That takes him out of the mortal sin. If he recovers, however, he must confess the sin like anyone else.

QUESTION

"WHY DO WE HAVE TO ABSTAIN FROM MEAT ON FRIDAYS? WHY COULDN'T IT BE A DIFFERENT FOOD INSTEAD OF MEAT?"

ANSWER:

Well, that's a good one! Don't I, too, wish it were something else instead of meat, spinach, for example. Seriously though, it did not have to be meat. The reason it is meat is simply that meat forms the backbone of most meals. And since the Church wanted us to give up something that would really be a penance for us, she decided on meat. But it could have been anything. And so, we all do that penance in honor of and out of love for Our Lord who died for us on Friday.

QUESTION

"CAN WATER FOWL SUCH AS DUCK AND GEESE BE EATEN ON FRIDAY?"

ANSWER:

It all depends on what locality you are in. In some places, I understand, wild duck and so on are considered sea food and classed with fish. Therefore, they can be eaten on Friday. See your pastor and follow his advice.

QUESTION

"CAN A NON-CATHOLIC BE SPONSOR AT A CATHOLIC BAPTISM?"

ANSWER:

The answer is "No". Godparents, you see, take upon themselves the responsibility of raising the child in the Catholic Faith, should the parents die or fail to do so. A non-Catholic godparent could hardly raise the child in the Faith, if he himself did not believe in it. Sponsorship in Baptism, remember, is no mere honorary position.

RADIO BROADCAST

10

"The Catholic Church on Pomp and Ritual."

Dear Radio Friends,

The letter runs: "Rev. Father Foley Dear Sir Would you kindly explain how you can reconcile the pomp and splendour with which the Roman Catholic Church has clothed the Pope, with the humility and poverty of Jesus of Galilee, who had no ecclesiastical rank, no worldly possessions, in fact, nowhere to lay his head." Signed, Yours truly . . . All of which serves me admirably as an introduction to my subject tonight! For this evening, I want to tell you all about the magnificent pomp and ceremony with which the Catholic Church clothes not only the Pope but every ceremony and ritual in her worship.

The Catholic Faith is indeed a Faith of ritual. There is a generous display of finery in her externals, and a great deal of pageantry and drama in her worship. Why is this? Does not a reliance on material things tend to drag down the lofty purpose of Christianity which is essentially spiritual? Is there need for any ceremony in order to know and love God? Isn't all this pomp and ritual rather a drag on the soul, tending to distract and paralyse the soul in its reachings out for the invisible God? Why then, does the Catholic Church raise all these magnificent cathedrals, why all this color and rich vestments? Isn't it a vain display lowering and debasing the spiritual to the coarse level of the material. That, Dear Friends, is the problem. What is the solution? The answer is very simple, beautiful and satisfying. It is this:

A. THE PRINCIPLE INVOLVED

First of all, let us lay down the principle or truth that solves everything. Man is not an angel. He is a man. An angel, you see, is a spiritual being, with a mind and will but no body. Angels really exist; we have the Word of God for that. Only you and I cannot see them. They are spirits. And their knowledge of things comes

directly into their minds. They do not have to form an image in their minds over like you, and I have to do. Their knowledge is infused.

Now on the other hand are different. We have bodies, and God so made us that all our knowledge of things must come radically at least through our five senses: the senses of sight, touch, taste, sight and hearing. We cannot have any knowledge except through one or several or all of the senses of our body. For example you and I as children first learned what love was through the looks and caresses of our mothers. But love itself is not a name, something spiritual, we cannot see it. And we further find that when we want to express the love that is in us for some other person here on earth, we cannot do it except by external actions which can be seen or felt or heard. That is why when a boy is in love with a girl he tries to express his love for her by bringing her a box of chocolates which she can taste, he tells her that he loves her words which she can hear, he brings her roses which she can smell. Not all at once mind you, on the part and would be bankrupt. But do you see the idea? Spiritual things find an easy and natural expression in appropriate external actions. In fact these actions appropriate and external help the soul to appreciate the depth and grandeur of a spiritual reality, love.

It is that way with all spiritual realities. Did you ever stop to figure out why a judge in court wears a long black gown of office? He doesn't just come in his shirt sleeves. Why the gown? Because the administration of justice is a serious and weighty thing. And the solemn gown sets the mind and conveys in an external way something very real but invisible, the dignity of the law. The black-robed figure leading the water on top of the courthouse is the same thing. It externalizes in something that can be seen the presence of the law to give unbiased justice, a thing very real but invisible.

It is simply treating with such examples of external things being used to help the soul appreciate something very real but spiritual. We see it everywhere. Why for example do you think a June bride wears a long flowing white satin gown? To express her beauty and immortality on her wedding day. Beauty and immortality! Tell me did you ever see beauty itself? Or immortality itself? No, but you can see a lovely bride, a beautiful dove, a gold wedding ring. Or again, why do we erect monuments to our fallen soldiers? Couldn't we just remember them in our hearts. Surely. But our human spirit craves to externalize that gratitude because we cannot

our gratitude itself. Why do soldiers wear uniforms, why do we salute the flag? — all external symbols that express something very real, but spiritual, allegiance to the king, loyalty and the like.

It is the same with religion. True, the kingdom of God is within us, it is something spiritual. But we find a craving in our hearts to express in an external way the power and majesty and beauty and love and devotion — everything that religion implies. God is a spirit. But who can *love* a spirit? We can, however, love a father, because when we think of a father, we immediately remember how good our own earthly father was to us. How much more wonderfully good there must be our Heavenly Father. That is why, when we were little children, in school, the good sisters gave us — as a reward, holy pictures showing God, our Heavenly Father, as a kindly old man, with a long white beard. Which, of course, we all know that God is not old and he hasn't got a beard. But we all understood that He was a Father and the beard — well, I suppose it had to do with God's being eternal.

From the very beginning, men sought to express the majesty and grandeur of God that they felt in their hearts. In the Old Testament God Himself took a hand. Under Solomon, He commanded His Chosen people, the Jews, to build that most magnificent temple in Jerusalem made with precious gems and the purest gold. Centuries after the same Christians did the same. As soon as they came up out of the catacombs following the persecutions, they built those magnificent cathedrals to remind all men of the power and majesty and grandeur of the Almighty God. Their carving gothic arches, like joined hands, were a prayer in stone, their steeples, a finger pointing the eyes of men to heaven, their stained glass windows, the gospel story in color. And through her glorious choirs, Holy Mother Church waited the souls of her children up to the very courts of heaven where angelic choirs never cease their hymn of praise before the throne of God.

B. APPLICATION TO SITUAL:

And what of the Church's ceremony and her vestments. If men and women, out of respect for their monarch, don their finest best to appear at the court of an earthly king, shall the Church's priests, in their official act of worship of the Eternal King, do less? Shall they appear in their ordinary clothes before the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords? That is why her vestments are of the finest

weave, gold-encrusted and jewel-bedecked, that all the faithful may sense and see and feel and hear and catch something of the majesty of what is happening. The psalms are eternal. There, the Church reads: Wash me, O Lord. Sprinkle me with hyssop and I shall be cleansed. (Ps. 50:9). And so the Church, sprinkles the faithful with holy water, a beautiful symbol of how their souls are cleansed as they approach to worship God. Let my prayer, say the psalms, rise like incense in Thy sight. Ps. 140:2, And to remind Catholics of how their prayers rise to God like a sweet smoking incense, she actually does use incense that all may see and smell and know what is meant by it.

Thus it is with all the ceremonies and grandeur one finds in the Catholic Church. We all know, of course, that grandeur simply for the sake of grandeur would be nothing but vanity. Symbolism simply for the sake of mystification would be nonsense. But symbolism for the sake of externalizing the spiritual is one of the deepest cravings of the human heart. Not only is it beauty. It is the genius of human psychology.

CONCLUSION:

So, when the Pope is carried aloft through St. Peter's, imparting his blessing to the Faithful, when he is vested in all the magnificent robes of his office as Supreme Pontiff, it is not the glorification of a man that is taking place. He himself, is but a human being like the rest of us. And just in case it should go to his head on his coronation day, at the very climax of his elevation, someone goes before him with a smoking flax, crying out: "Sancte Pater. Sic transit gloria mundi." Holy Father, remember. As a smoking flax, so passes the glory of this world. And believe me, there is precious little need to remind him. He knows it better than anyone else. Like every other Catholic in the world, he, too, must get down on his knees and confess his sins to a simple priest. And each year, on Holy Thursday, in memory of Our Lord's washing the feet of His Apostles, the Pope dons an apron and on his knees washes and kisses the feet of twelve poor men from the streets of Rome. His greatest glory, though, is in his title: Pius, servant of the servants of God.

What about the humble Christ who had not where to lay His head? That is perfectly true. But just as true is the other fact, that many either seem to forget or want to ignore, namely, that He is also the same Christ who gladly ate with the rich, who rode into

Jerusalem in triumph and allowed the people to spread their garments and strew branches in His path, while they cried out "Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord." And when the Pharisees would have silenced them, it is the same humble Christ who said "I tell you that if these hold their peace, the stones will cry out" (Lk. 19: 40). Yes, and it is also the same humble Christ who allowed Mary Magdalene to pour the precious ointment on His feet. And when Judas cried out in mock scandal: "To what purpose is this waste? for this might have been sold for much and given to the poor." (Mt. 26: 9), the same humble Christ said "For the poor you have always with you, but you do not always have me." (Mt. 26: 11).

That was the balance of Christ's attitude towards pomp and ritual — sensible and moderate as always. And that, too, will ever be the attitude of His Church.

God Bless You.

J. M. J. A. M.

FEB. 6th, 1952

QUESTION BOX.

10

QUESTION:

"IS IT TRUE THAT A CATHOLIC CANNOT BE TRUE TO HIS COUNTRY IF HE SHOWS ALLEGIANCE TO THE POPE?"

ANSWER:

Good Heavens! Where did you ever get that? That sounds like sentences of an anti-Catholic speaker, throwing out wild charges with reckless abandon. What is the simple truth of the matter? Every Catholic in the world owes complete and perfect allegiance to the Pope in all spiritual matters. But except for the thousand or so people actually living within the confines of Vatican City in the heart of Rome — No Catholic in the world owes the Pope any allegiance whatever in purely temporal matters. So, if the Holy Father speaks to us in matters of religion, we obey. Because we believe that as chief shepherd of the flock, he has been divinely appointed by Christ Himself to rule and guide the Church in His name. And

that in this task, the pope is protected by God from leading us into error. There, however, his jurisdiction ends. Consequently, if the pope were to tell Canadian Catholics to vote C. C. F. or Liberal or Conservative, to live here or there, to buy this kind of a car rather than that... in a word... in anyone or all purely temporal matters, we would very politely but firmly tell him that he was completely out of order. As for loyalty to Canada, no group ever has or ever will be more patriotic than Catholics... from Jacques Cartier who discovered Canada in the first place to the French Canadians who fought with the British against the Americans in the war of 1812, right down to Prime Minister St. Laurent and Canada's famous Van Doos from Quebec City who just the other day won a mass citation for valor in Korea. In fact, I don't know why I am even saying this much. We don't have to defend our patriotism to anyone and everyone who makes ridiculous statements.

QUESTION

IS IT TRUE, THERE NEVER WAS A MORE TOTALITARIAN SYSTEM ON EARTH THAN THE PAPACY?

ANSWER

That is another statement of the same kind and I don't suppose I should dignify its absurdity by even answering it. Yet, I suppose, there are some people who honestly believe that. So, in charity to them, here is the answer. Totalitarianism means just what it says, total. And I have just shown you that in the entire universe of purely temporal matters, the Pope hasn't a blessed word to say. Even in the spiritual realm, the only claim the Church has on Catholics is their conscience. "He who hears you, hears me," Christ said to the Church. That's all. And if a Catholic does not want to be a good Catholic, nobody in the world will force him to be good. Every Catholic is on his own. So, if a Catholic misses Mass on Sunday, believe me, there'll be no priest hammering down his door to drag him out of bed and throw him in papal concentration camp. There'll be no papal police squad to go through restaurants on Friday ready to threaten any Catholic who so much as looks at a steak. If that is totalitarianism, then all I can say, is that the Pope is a mighty poor hand at it. He'd be well advised to try something else.

QUESTION:

"IS IT TRUE THE INDIVIDUAL CATHOLIC IS HELD IN MENTAL AND SPIRITUAL BONDAGE?"

ANSWER:

Same answer as above. Next, Don.

QUESTION:

"IS IT FORBIDDEN TO DANCE ON FRIDAYS? SOME PRIESTS SAY "YES" AND OTHERS SAY "NO".

ANSWER:

The reason some priests say "yes" and others say "no" is that they are dealing with different cases. Ukrainian Catholics as I have already explained before, are forbidden under pain of serious sin, to dance not only on Fridays but on any day during Advent or Lent. Latin or Roman rite Catholics are not so forbidden, though they would do well to abstain from all public dances during those times. As for the remaining Fridays of the year, people could not be forbidden under pain of sin to take part in respectable dances. Fittingness, however, would certainly rule out dancing on Good Friday.

RADIO BROADCAST.**II.****"The Catholic Church on Brotherhood."**

Dear Radio Friends:

The work is Brotherhood Week throughout Canada. It is sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews and its whole aim is negatively, to dispel bigotry and prejudice among all Canadians and positively to establish a spirit of tolerance, good-will and brotherhood among all of us living in this great and wonderful land of ours.

It is a noble aim and worthy of our utmost effort. But let us not deceive ourselves. True brotherhood among men is not a goal that can be achieved by wishful thinking. Much has can't be attained by invoking the wrong motives or by trying to build the edifice of true brotherhood on artificial foundations. I mention this because, almost invariably, that is precisely what has happened in the past. Men have tried to build tolerance and good will on such slogans as "We are all in this together, why can't we forget our differences and live in peace." Such foundations are false, they stand up fairly well in normal times, but under the stress of strong emotion, fatigue or irritation, they crumble. And crumble they must, because they are artificial and therefore, false. There is one reason and one reason only why all of us should love one another with a genuine love and therefore live in true and solid peace. What is that reason?

A. TRUE BASIS OF BROTHERHOOD:

It is this. We are all brothers only because God is the common Father of us all. If a man does not believe in God, there is really no valid reason why he should love his neighbor. He may speak of humanitarian motives for getting along with his fellowman. Thus, for example, he may say that since we all have to live together on this earth, then for the sake of sheer peace in our own lives, we must try and get along and stop flying at one another's throats. But

that kind of a motive is not enough. And if you need any proof of this, then, the frustrations and wranglings that we see hobbling even the best efforts of the delegates at the United Nations in their gropings for peace are all too tragic a witness that man-made reasons for brotherhood are not sufficient. That is why no atheist or agnostic can find a genuine and selfless reason to love his fellowman. Anyone can tolerate his fellowman. But that is a purely negative word. It comes from the Latin word meaning to suffer, and God help us if we try to run our world on anything so negative as mere tolerance. Likewise the word brotherhood itself can be ambiguous. At this time, people have become so used to having it bandied about and used as a platitude that they have forgotten exactly that brotherhood means absolutely nothing, unless it is related to and flows from the Fatherhood of God.

If the same token if you turn the whole case around and start from the Fatherhood of God, then the perfect motive for Brotherhood Work becomes immediately apparent. For if God is the Creator of us all, then it follows that every man on earth is a creature of God, whether the color of the man's skin be white, black, red, yellow or brown, he is a creature of God whether he be English, French, German, Negro, Irish, Chinese, or anything else.

Now go a step further. The Bible tells us moreover that in addition to that every one of us is made to the image and likeness of God, not in our bodies, of course, for God is a spirit and has no body. There can be no similarity there. But rather that each of the body of each one of us, there is a precious and immortal spiritual soul. And that it is in our soul that we are made to the image and likeness of God. We are in a certain sense, each of us a reflection of God, much the same as many pieces of glass hung on the ground reflect the brilliance of the one sun that shines on them and enables them so to speak partake of its dazzling light.

With this as a basis stop. But Divine Love Jesus Christ came in earth and tells us that not only was God our Creator and Maker, but that above all, He was Our Father and would if we'd allow Him make us all His adopted sons.

And there you have it. Since God is the common Father of us all and since we are all His children His adopted sons, then all of us, in the truest sense of the word, are brothers under the skin. Add to this, as indeed you must, the tremendous mystery of the Incarnation and the Redemption and you have the complete picture.

Our Divine Lord, Jesus Christ the Son of God, came down here on earth, took on our human nature and thus became True Man and our Elder Brother. All men, therefore, became brothers of Christ through His sharing of our common human nature and in the divine mystery of His redeeming death on the cross, all men became in Christ brothers among themselves. (It is St. Paul put it a point here with Christ. Rom. 8:17)

In this embracing truth of the Fatherhood of God, together with the Incarnation and Redemption, you have the one and ultimate reason for any Brotherhood Week.

B. BIGOTRY AND PREJUDICE.

Once you have this first principle of truth clearly understood and firmly established in your mind, then, you can see immediately, a whole host of conclusions that follows.

Men disagree not only on religion, but on just about every other subject under the sun. Now if a person is honestly and soundly convinced of something, then, no stretch of imagination can you call it broadmindedness on his part, if he says that the opposite may be just as true. That is not tolerance that is just sloppy thinking. Contradictions simply cannot both be true at the same time and under the same aspect. Intellectual honesty is involved here.

But from that point at no man then go over to bigotry. Bigotry you see, is shortsightedness, for one thing. It says that because you disagree and even violently perhaps, with the view a man holds, you must therefore hate the man himself who holds them. That I say is shortsightedness. It is faulty reasoning, it is ungodly it is unchristian. If you disagree in all sincerity, with another man's convictions on religion, politics, nationality or anything else, all right. It is presumed that you are being sincere about it and you must follow an honest conscience. But you are never allowed to hate or despise the man himself who holds those opinions with which you disagree. For, that man, as a man, as another human being like yourself is God's creature and son, even as you yourself are God's creature and son, he is your brother even as you are his. And you may never hate your brother under any condition, for if you do, it is really God whom you are hating, since it is in His image that your brother has been made. Now you can see the whole depth of meaning in Our Lord's command: "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with thy whole heart and with thy whole soul and with all thy mind

and with all thy strength. This is the greatest and the first commandment. And the second is like to it: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (St. Math. 22: 37)

Dear Friends, in the course of a lifetime, you and I are going to meet with a great many convictions, outlooks and opinions on the part of others, with which we simply and sincerely cannot agree. All right, life is like that. On the one hand let us not be so foolish as to go for the modern fad that says that, since there is so much disagreement then nobody can really get at the truth at all; that, indeed, truth itself is only relative. That is not intellectual humility, as some would like to pretend. That is nothing but a particularly contemptible form of mental laziness and cowardice that leads to intellectual suicide. On the other hand however, let us also be big enough, God-like and Christian enough, to realize that underneath all convictions, however wrong, stands a human being, a brother whose Father is our Father and that therefore and precisely for that reason, we may not only not hate him, but must positively love him with the same divine Christian charity with which we love ourselves. For, when we love our neighbor with that beautiful thing called Christian charity, it is really God whom we are loving in our neighbor.

This is called Brotherhood Week. That, to me is weak. Let us not be satisfied with anything so negative as mere tolerance. Let us not even be satisfied with the mere general idea of Brotherhood. That is too vague. Rather, let us be content with nothing less than a real, genuine Christian charity and love for every one around us. That is positive. And that, in the final analysis, is the only real way to love with our whole heart, mind, soul and strength, the God who first loved us.

God Bless You.

QUESTION BOX.

11.

QUESTION.

WHY ARE PRIESTS CALLED 'FATHER'?

ANSWER:

The title "Father" is one of respect and reverence given by Catholics to priests. The reason why a priest is called "Father" is that he does everything for the spiritual life of a person's soul, that an ordinary human father does for the physical life of his child. In Baptism, for example, the priest begets or brings to spiritual life a soul that was spiritually dead in Original sin. In Confession, he heals the wounds caused after on in that person's life by personal sins. In Holy Communion, he nourishes the soul with the Divine Bread of Life, Our Lord's own very Body and Blood. In Marriage, the priest brings down the blessing of God upon the union of the Faithful. And in Extreme Unction, he prepares and comforts the soul in its passage out of this world and into eternity. That is why a priest is called "Father." I suppose it is but an echo of St. Paul's own words to the Corinthians: "For in Christ Jesus, by the Gospel, have I begotten you" (Cor. 5: 15). That, I say, from St. Paul who freely called Timothy "my son."

QUESTION.

"DO YOU THINK THAT YOUNG MARRIED WOMEN SHOULD HOLD DOWN A JOB?"

ANSWER:

It is difficult to give a straight "Yes" or "No" answer to such a question, as all kinds of circumstances can enter in to influence each individual case. But the general principle always holds. If it becomes necessary for a married woman to hold down a job in order to make financial ends meet and to care for the very necessities of life, then, evidently, the answer is "Yes." Otherwise, however, the mind of the Church is against married women being mixed up in the business world. And I rather think that most husbands would be against it too.

QUESTION:

IF A GIRL HAS LOST HER VIRGINITY, IS SHE ALLOWED TO BE MARRIED IN A VEIL AND WREATH?"
ANSWER:

Well, first of all, remember that no one has to be married in a veil and wreath. It is simply a beautiful tradition symbolizing the purity and loveliness of the young bride. So, it is a nice custom but by no means universal. Therefore, if, in this particular case, failing to wear a veil and wreath would amount to the bride's giving her self away, then, by all means she may wear a veil and wreath. No one, after all, is bound to make public sins committed in the past. It is on the other hand, there is no particular call for a veil and wreath. I suppose it would be better if she wore something else. Remember, in all this, the important thing is not the clothes that are worn. The important thing is that the soul be shining with the gleaming wedding garment of God's grace.

QUESTION:

WHY DO CATHOLICS BAPTIZE THEIR INFANTS INSTEAD OF WAITING TILL THEY GROW UP?"

ANSWER:

Because every human being, even an infant, has a precious immortal soul that must be saved by the Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ. And Baptism is the sacrament He instituted to confer the grace of salvation on every man, woman and child. "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost," said Our Lord, "he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." John 3:5. Therefore, if a child who had not yet reached the use of reason were to die without being baptized, he would not enter the happiness of heaven. The child would be perfectly happy in a natural way for all eternity, but it simply would not qualify for the supernatural joy of seeing God face to face, which is the unpeakable joy of heaven.

QUESTION:

WHAT DO THE LETTERS ON THE CRUCIFIX STAND FOR?"

ANSWER:

On most crucifixes are found the four letters "I.N.R.I." They are the first letters of the four Latin words "Jesus Nazarenus, Rex Judaeorum" Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews." The sign or inscription Pilate ordered written in Latin, Hebrew and Greek and affixed to the cross of Christ on Calvary.

RADIO BROADCAST.

12.

"The Catholic Church on Priests and Nuns."

Dear Radio Friends

Of recent years, priests and nuns have come in for a good deal of publicity. Their bizarre conduct in the face of Communist persecution whether in Europe or in Asia, has commanded the respect of the whole world. Even in normal times, priests and nuns provide a never-fading source of interest for the newspapers, and Hollywood itself has come to learn that the role of a priest or a nun in a movie is, for some strange magic reason, an almost sure fire guarantee of success at the box office.

Not all the publicity, however, has been favorable. Every now and then, with monotonous regularity, some fallen-away priest writes a book against the priesthood in a rather pathetic effort to try to justify his own guilty conscience. (I come in with a eye to the money that can be made from bigotry, darts off the *Horrible Revelations of a Nun*, - or some such penny dreadful - and lo and behold, once again, poor old Maria Monk is dragged from her tomb and made to rise again. That she was never a nun in the first place, that her *Awful Revelations* have been exposed time and time again to be nothing but the awful vapors of a rather awful imagination, matters not. A certain section of the public needs in that particular kind of fiction - therefore.

Now, all this attention may be highly interesting, but it hardly gives a true picture of priests and nuns. On the one hand, the attacks on the priesthood and sisterhood are a little too transparent in their hatred. But on the other hand, the glamorizing of priests and nuns by Hollywood is somewhat exaggerated to say the least. Not all nuns look like Loretta Young or Claudette Colbert. And heaven itself is only too painfully aware that not all priests sing like Bing Crosby. So, tonight, I would like to tell you a few things about priests and nuns, that are really true. You see, I happen to

know quite a few men and as for priests, well, I'm pretty but rather tremendously proud to be able to say I am a priest.

A. PRIESTS:

To begin with let's take priests. There are about 100,000 priests all over the world drawn from just about every nationality and color under the sun. Here in Canada there are some 14,000 of us looking after Catholics from Newfoundland to Victoria right up to the Arctic circle and beyond. People often wonder what makes a Catholic young man want to be a priest in the first place. Well, that's a very good question. First of all he must have certain qualifications. He must have reasonably good health, a good mind, and above all a good moral life. But the spark that really sets him on the path to the goal of his dreams is the drive to consecrate himself to God entirely and to work for Him the rest of his life. And so, he starts out a very hard path of intense study last before him usually a seven long. Having finished his high school the young man must complete his college and arts course and then be in ready for three years of philosophy and four or four more years of theology. This long period of training serves a double purpose. Not only is it necessary for the mastering of the studies involved, it is vital for the great decision that must be made, a twofold decision. The superior must judge before God whether they believe the young man has the character capacity and ability to make a good priest, and on his part the young man must decide whether he wants to take the step that will make him a priest forever. If the decision is favorable on both sides then at long last the great day arrives knowing what he undergoes remains is that long, unbroken line of ordinations that goes back through the centuries to the Apostles and to Christ the power to hang the bread and wine into the very Body and Blood of Christ together with the power to forgive sins in the name of God, just as the Apostles. He is now a priest forever, for better or for worse according as he himself strives to live up to that wonderfully high ideal or whether through his own fault he falls miserably short of the sublime dignity of his calling. It is all up to him. And I am wonderfully proud to say that over 99% of priests the world over prove true to their calling. It is only in the very rarest case that a priest proves false to the vows he made to God and falls away. Even one fallen-away priest shocks and hurts

us, but it does not throw us into a panic. We feel terrible about it, but we also remember that there was one Judas in the first Twelve.

People also wonder at times, why priests do not marry. The answer is simple. There is no law of God or of nature forbidding them to marry. It is simply a Church law and it was made because it was found that priests could do their work far better if they remained unmarried. To begin with, priests want to pattern their whole life on that of Our Lord, Jesus Christ, and He never married. Priests are following in the footsteps of the Apostles, and although some of them were married, Scripture also reports that they left all things to follow Christ. They became truly dedicated men, so do priests. Or as St. Paul so well put it: "He who is unmarried, is solicitous for the things of the Lord, how he may please God. But he who is married is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife, and he is divided." (1 Cor 7: 32). It is precisely because priests do not want to be divided that they do not marry. Not because they could not be good priests, married, but simply because they themselves, the great body of the faithful and the whole Church of God, feel that they can be better priests unmarried. And the whole course of history has wonderfully borne out the wisdom of that decision.

I. NUNS.

As far as nuns are concerned, they are, in many ways, the same as priests. They are Catholic girls who, in the full bloom of young womanhood, decide that they too would like to consecrate their whole lives to God and work for Him. Instead of giving themselves to another human being in marriage, they give themselves to God in love. Instead of having a family of their own, they pour out their love on the little ones of others, on the sick, the aged, the poor and orphans. And they do it out of love for God. There wild, romantic novels that picture nuns either as women jilted in love or forgotten along the way, or as timid, flattery creatures running away from the battle of life. That sort of thing is enough to make any mature person smile; it makes nuns positively chuckle. And as for these land, anti-Catholic pamphlets with screaming headlines: "Open the convent prison and let the poor girls out!" well, if any of you listening tonight, really believe that, then I'll tell you what to do. The next time you see a nun downtown, just go up to

her and say "Now that you're out, why don't you start running." and see what she says to you. If she is the serious type, she'd probably try to set you straight on the matter. But if she has a sense of humor — and most nuns have — she will probably keep a straight face, and ask you daskly "Do you really think I could get away?"

I think nuns are the most wonderful, and as a whole, the happiest women in the world. They are immensely practical, as they go about their tasks of teaching children, running hospitals and orphanages and caring for the aged, infirm and crippled of this world. They are human, of course, and like priests, they too, have their faults and failings. Even Sisters, you know, get tired sometimes, they too, can fall sick and perhaps give in to impatience or fail in charity. But they never cease to work on even their smallest faults. Like priests, they too, strive without letup to reproduce in their souls, the image of Our Divine Lord. And I, for one, believe they do a rather fine job of it.

In any case, where will you find another group of women in the world who have given up their right to marriage and the human consolation of having a family of their own — why? — to live out their lives working for others, hidden from the eyes of the world and without ever receiving any personal monetary reward? It must be a sublime ideal indeed, that can inspire such a life. And it is. Nothing could do it short of a tremendous love for God.

CONCLUSION

So, there are your priests and nuns. You can see why their lives command the respect and admiration even of people who are not Catholics. And you can begin to understand too, something of the warm feeling of pride and of possession with which the Faithful surround their priests and nuns. As for the Sisters, just pray that the Good Lord will always keep them as wonderful as they are. As for priests, if the dignity of their calling is infinitely greater than that of anyone else, just remember that the answer they must give to God for their priesthood, is likewise infinitely more serious than any you shall have to render. So, pray for us, won't you, that we shall always be good priests, after the heart of Our Dear Lord Himself.

God Bless You

QUESTION BOX

11.

QUESTION:

"WHAT ABOUT THAT LAW IN MONTREAL REQUIRING NON-CATHOLIC STORES TO CLOSE ON CATHOLIC HOLY DAYS? ISN'T THAT RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION?"

ANSWER:

I'm glad you brought that up. I have been wanting to say something about that for some time. There is no religious persecution whatever here. It is not primarily, a religious question at all. It is first and foremost, a question of pure business courtesy and ordinary politeness. Do you realize that radically that same law holds everywhere in Canada. It holds right here in Saskatoon. Saskatoon is a city of some 40,000 people and Protestant people constitute the great majority of its citizens. Catholics are a small minority and so are the Jews. Now, for Jewish people Sunday is not the day of rest. Their holy day or Sabbath is Saturday. Yet, this predominantly Protestant city of Saskatoon has no qualms of conscience whatever in passing a law that requires all stores, Jewish as well as Christian to close on Sunday. Is that religious persecution of the Jews? Not at all. Nor do we hear our Jewish neighbors crying that it is so. On the contrary, Jewish business men in this city are only too glad to close on Sunday, both out of respect for the wishes of the majority, as well as out of common business courtesy for their Christian fellow citizens, who, after all constitute the bulk of their customers. Note well, that no one requires that Jews go to church on Sunday. They are simply required to close their stores along with everyone else.

Exactly the same situation obtains in Montreal, Canada's metropolis and largest city is overwhelmingly Catholic—about 80% or so. There are small minorities of Protestants and Jews. Now, as far as I know, Jewish businessmen have been more than ready to close on the four Catholic holy-days required by law. They have done this out of ordinary politeness towards their Catholic customers,

the overwhelming majority of the population. No one asks non-Catholics in Montreal to go to church on Catholic holy-days. They are simply required by law to close their stores out of respect for the wishes of the majority and to avoid unfair business advantage. So, what's all the fuss about? Is the same law all right in Saskatoon and the rest of Canada and all wrong in Montreal? Catholics have always been ready to return the compliment. For example, Victoria Day, May 24th, means very little to the majority of Catholics who happen to be of French origin. Yet, they gladly close their stores along with everyone else. "So by all means, let there be courtesy and regard for one another. But, in all fairness, don't you think it is about time, it began to work both ways?"

QUESTION.

"ARE CATHOLICS ALLOWED TO READ THE BIBLE?"

ANSWER.

Catholics are not only allowed, they are most strongly urged to do so. Only, the Church wants them to read the whole Bible while they're at it and not just part of it. Versions that leave out whole books of the Bible, calling them apocryphal, are simply mutilated Bibles and therefore forbidden. Just as one would not consult a map of Canada that left out whole provinces.

RADIO BROADCAST.

13.

"The Catholic Church and Science."

Dear Radio Friends:

There was a time — and not so long ago either — when it was quite the fashion to speak of the deadly conflict that existed between Science and Religion; in fact they told us that during the last century the struggle split the world of thought into two armed camps. Some said that the Catholic Church was the deadly enemy of a new science, while others held out so tightly that the Church was saving the greatest mind and pattern Science ever had. Back and forth the battle raged until at last spent and weary, the combatants began to examine each others position. And lo and behold, it was soon discovered that what both sides were attacking, was what is their own mind. I say that because I grew almost about the deadly conflict between Science and Religion has long since been laid to rest and no theologian or scientist worthy of the name would attempt it and expect to be taken seriously. For we all know that there is such a thing as true religion, which however must never be confused with the false sentimental religionism which likes to masquerade as religion. It is that pathetic emotionalism that the scientist cannot stomach. Likewise there is a deep and genuine discipline that is true Science. But that in turn must not be confused with that burlesque lot of cap's headed pompous called Scientism. That is something the theologian cannot stand. Between false religion and false science the controversies are considerable, as indeed they must be. But between true religion and true science, there can never be real conflict since one and the same eternal God, who is Truth itself is the Author of both Religion and Science. And God cannot contradict Himself. Let me try to show you how that works out:

A. FALSE RELIGION AND FALSE SCIENCE.

On the one hand Science with its deadly accuracy experimental method and meticulous research has made short work of all those mockeries that tried to pass themselves off as true Religion. Science has shown up false visions, trances and healings for the hoaxes they are. And as this is unimpeachable to the point.

On the other hand Science itself needs to be clearly understood. There are sciences and sciences. Any ordered study of effects in their causes and principles is a science. The trouble is that today, almost everyone has foolishly come to identify all Sciences in general with the physical sciences such as chemistry, physics, biology and the like. How such a blunder ever gained acceptance is a mystery since the physical sciences however important they may be constitute only one small corner of the great map of Science in general. Moreover the physical sciences have means and tests of arriving at the truth that are peculiar to the physical sciences and to them alone. These include the test tube, the scale, the microscope and so on, because the correct and proper object of the physical sciences is matter, the physical universe that can be measured, weighed and seen.

But when certain people try to pretend that the physical sciences are everything, that all truths must be able to be verified by physical tests, then, you have Scientism. Scientism means that particularly insufferable uniqueness that would rule out all spiritual and moral values because they do not happen to be verifiable by the means physical sciences have set up to find the truth. As though you could put morality into a test tube or look at eternity or the soul through a microscope. This may sound like an oversimplification of the matter but basically it is precisely what is at the root of all agnostic and materialistic thinking. Because God, religion and the rest cannot be checked and verified by the senses, then, say these agnostics, we can know nothing about them with certainty. The answer, of course, is obvious. Since when did all scientific conclusions have to pass the tests of physical science before they can be declared true? Who said so? Thus I say, in the rather brash and unscientific arrogance known as Scientism. It is a case of the tail trying to wag the dog. Or to use another example. It's like saying, 'Unless you can show me every place in Canada, on a C.P.R. timetable, that place is not in Canada.' Someone will simply have to take such a person aside and break the

arms to him gently, that there is also such a thing as a C. N. R. timetable. So when you get a gem like this, for example: "God and immortality find no support in science" then you know that it is a creature of Scientism talking. In the cramped and narrow confines of his small mind, he can see nothing except in terms of the physical sciences. It is this type of unscientific and narrow-minded braininess that the Church contains without mercy.

B. TRUE RELIGION AND TRUE SCIENCE.

On the other hand, the Catholic Church has only the greatest regard for all true science, whether it be the science of theology, the science of man, or the science of the physical universe, as long as it remains true science and does not degenerate into gratuitous theorizing. In all the long history of the Church I find only one instance where she made a blunder in policy in this regard, and that was in the case of Galileo. And since the case did not directly involve faith or morals, it was not too serious. Yet, not a strange lion the enemies of the Catholic Church keep harping on this one isolated case of Galileo and are completely blind and oblivious to the simply staggering contributions that Catholics and the Church have made to science in every age. Art, music, and architecture reached their zenith in the ages of Faith. I think of men like Dante, Mozart, Beethoven, Bramante, Michelangelo, Raphael, Leonardo da Vinci, Giotto, Fra Angelico and hundreds of other Catholic artists who have produced the masterpieces of the world's masterpieces of literature, music, painting, sculpture.

Virtually all the great universities of the Old World were founded by the Catholic Church — from Oxford and Cambridge, to Paris, Bologna, Vienn, Heidelberg and the rest. I recall the great toil of Catholics in the field of chemistry from Lavoisier, the founder of modern chemistry — to Pasteur who made possible your pasteurized milk — to Madame Curie, the heroine of radium.

The Faithful who were prominent in the field of astronomy are simply too numerous to mention. And when you come to electricity, it sounds like Old Home Week. Galvanized iron is named after the Italian, Galvani. Your 110 Volts are in honor of another Italian, Volta. Ampere, yet another electrical term and Ohm, still another, are named after the Frenchman, Ampere and Ohm the German.

all of whom were not only members of the Church but devout Catholics.

And so the roll call goes on and on, through every one of the sciences I think of X Rays and Roentgen, or I think of Discoveries and Martin Polo, and Columbus and Amerigo Vespucci I think of Magellan and Vasco da Gama and of Fathers Marquette and Joliet and De Soto. Truly a glorious host. The Church is quietly proud of her children who have been among the pioneers and most prominent figures in all the fields of Science.

CONCLUSION

William Gladstone who was one of Britain's greatest Prime Ministers and a foremost scholar in his own right had this tribute to pay to the Church even though he himself was not a Catholic.

Since the first three hundred years of persecution, the Roman Catholic Church has marched for 1500 years at the head of human civilization and has driven harnessed to its chariot as the horses of a triumphal car the chief intellectual and material forces of the world, its genius, the genius of the world its greatness, glory, grandeur and majesty have been a most though not absolutely all that, in these respects, the world has had to boast of.

Dear Friends, what I have said to you tonight has not been said for the sake of boasting. That would be childish and vain. I have said it to you, that all of you may know where the Church stands in relation to Science and what a debt Science owes the Church. The Catholic Church has the greatest regard for true science, she has none whatever for Scientism, which is solemn nonsense. Science itself can go only so far. Then Faith takes over. You thus have two different orders of knowledge both coming from the same Divine Source both working together in harmony and both meant to lead to the same God, who is the light of the Scientist and the strength of the Faithful.

God Bless You

QUESTION BOX

13.

QUESTION:

WHY IS IT IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH THAT THE PRIEST ALONE DRINKS ALL THE WINE, WHEN THE LORD SAID DRINK YE ALL, OF THIS. AFTER ALL, THE OTHERS NEED AND SHOULD HAVE THE LORD'S BLOOD JUST AS WELL.

ANSWER:

The irony of all this is that outside the Catholic Church, almost no one believes any more that the bread and wine are changed into the actual Body and Blood of the whole and living Christ. Now your question. In Holy Communion, the Faithful receive the true Body and blood of the whole or living Christ, whether they receive it or under the form of bread alone, wine alone or under both forms together. All three ways have been used in the Christian Church. That it is not necessary to receive Communion under both forms at once, is more than clear from the words of Christ Himself. The same Lord who said, "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you" (John 6:54) also said, "He that eateth this bread shall live forever" (John 6:58) And He who said, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood shall have everlasting life" (John 6:55), also said, "The bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world" (John 6:52), And finally He who said, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me and I in him" (John 6:57), also said, "He that eateth this bread shall live forever" (John 6:59). The reason why we receive the true Christ, whether under one or both forms, is that in Holy Communion, it is the Living Christ that we receive and not a dead body split in two, as it were. Thus, St Paul could say to the Corinthians, "Whoever shall eat this bread OR drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body AND the blood of the Lord" (1 Cor 11:27). So overwhelming is the evidence, in favor of the reading, "OR drink" that the non-Catholic Revised Version has corrected the erroneous "AND drink" of the King James version, which tried to imply that you had to receive

under both forms. If you will just look up the writings of the early Fathers of the Church you will see that there is no doubt whatever about it. St. Cyprian, for example, tells us that they used to give Communion to infants under the form of wine alone, in the early ages of the Church, though Communion under the form of bread was much more common. Today the Church continues to allow the Faithful to receive under either or both forms. Ukrainian Catholics receive under both forms. Latin rite Catholics receive under the form of bread alone partly for the sake of convenience. But there is no ground whatever in the history of the Christian Church for the idea that you must receive under both forms, otherwise you are not receiving the whole Christ. That is just a heresy that came in with John Huss back in the 14th century.

QUESTION:

"BUT WHAT ABOUT THE VERSE 'THE FLESH PROFITETH NOTHING. IT IS THE SPIRIT THAT GIVETH LIFE' (John 6: 64). DOESN'T THAT SHOW THAT THE BREAD AND WINE ARE ONLY SYMBOLICAL AND NOT THE TRUE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST? OR DOES THE BIBLE CONTRADICT ITSELF?"

ANSWER:

Since the bible is the word of God, it cannot contradict itself. What then is the explanation of that verse: "The flesh profiteth nothing; it is the spirit that giveth life." The Fathers of the Church answered that centuries ago. They bring out the fact that the word "flesh" here, means understanding the teaching of Christ on Communion in a fleshly or carnal way with the corrupted dispositions of darkened and sinful human nature, as contrasted with the understanding of his teaching by human nature enlightened and enriched by the grace of God, the "spirit". It was therefore, only the spiritual man of grace who could accept Christ at His word, when He said that the bread and wine would be changed into His true Body and Blood. St. John Chrysostom, for example, says "Why therefore, did He say: 'The flesh profiteth nothing.'? Not of His flesh does He mean this. Far from it. You see," he continues "there is question not of His flesh, but of the fleshly way of hearing" (In Joan. 47: 2).

RADIO BROADCAST.

14.

"The Catholic Church and Psychiatry."

Dear Radio Friends:

The most popular science today seems to be psychiatry. Psychology as the name itself suggests deals with the human spirit or personality particularly with its various anomalies and disorders. Now the study of man's mind is of course as old as man himself. But the formulating of rules to guide this study, the laying down of principles from which to start and the classification of various behaviour patterns — a study so that goes back long the modern manner of psychiatry all this is of rather recent appearance and owes much to the pioneering efforts of men like Freud and Jung.

Now the Catholic Church which has been dealing with men's souls since the dawn of Christianity is highly interested in psychiatry. For one thing the Church herself is an old hand at it having had some three centuries experience in applying psychiatry in the great school of the confessional. But more important is the Church is interested in the study of psychiatry because it is so fully matured by an established science. For that matter the fundamental principles upon which the entire science of psychiatry will be based. And it is regrettable that the study of psychiatry start from the right principles and not from the wrong ones. For should it be based on false premises the result would be disastrous. And lest anyone think this is but a phantom danger let him know that even now there is a small but wickedness school of psychiatrists who would like to do just that build the structure of psychiatry on false grounds. In general there are two extremes to be avoided where psychiatry is concerned. One is the tendency to discuss the whole thing in a lot of tomfoakery, a kind of scientific double talk to explain a guilty conscience right out of existence. The other is the equally foolish, though opposite extreme of pretending that psychiatry is a person that can account for and cure off the troubles that beset the souls of men.

A. PSYCHIATRY — A TRUE SCIENCE

Now the first thing you should know about psychiatry is that it is a true and valid science. While it is true that much of man's mental misery comes from the consciousness of a sin-laden life, just as equally true is it that many of his troubles stem from mental quirks and warpings. There very definitely are such things as complexes, frustrations and inhibitions that can and do give rise to mental anguish and a false sense of sin. Lifestyle, environment, upbringing and background do condition and sometimes to a very great extent the manner of a man's actions. It is the work of psychiatry to diagnose and identify the different behaviour patterns and to find a means of correcting them when they impair the human personality, thus restoring to man a healthy mental outlook and a balanced sense of judgment that will ensure peace of mind. That I say is the dedicated aim of psychiatry and if it can succeed in such a task, it is indeed benefiting mankind immeasurably. For aiming at so noble a goal, the Catholic Church applauds psychiatry in the highest terms and gives it unqualified support.

B. PSYCHIATRY — NO PANACEA

However like everything else in life, psychiatry is open to error and abuse and moreover it has its limits. For example. When, precisely, is a person suffering from the very real guilt of very real sin — and when is he but the victim of a guilt complex and a false sense of sin? Evidently the deciding factor will depend on the principles with which each individual psychiatrist starts out. Now most psychiatrists believe in God, in the immortality of the human soul and in the existence of an objective code of morality. These men constitute a majority of the great hosts of psychiatrists who have done so much work in the task of finding a cure for mental suffering. But, as in all other fields of human endeavour, so in the field of psychiatry, there is the inevitable group of radicals. As usually happens, these form but a small fringe on the outer edges of the profession. What they lack in numbers, however they more than make up for in noise. And usually their unwarranted assertions and wholesale generalizations betray that over-aggressiveness which is so typical a behaviour pattern of people who are not sure of themselves. Recently the C.B.C. very kindly treated us — at our own expense, by the way — to a series of lectures by this small but very vocal school

of psychiatrists. If one may judge from their own statements, these men and women seem to deny the existence of God, the immortality of the human soul and certainly the existence of an eternally fixed code of human morality. Their apparently is not there very much of the Ten Commandments. In fact, one of these gentlemen suggested that we stop teaching children the difference between right and wrong, since in this new "things, realities, fluid and keeps changing constantly" so that what we consider right today, possibly might very well become wrong tomorrow and vice versa. One wonders whether he would go so far as to apply that to murder, adultery, robbery and treason.

Now it is precisely this unmitigated drive, this solemn and pompous mouthings of psychiatric nonsense that the Catholic Church condemns for the exact reason. The Communists today are teaching children behind the Iron Curtain to betray their parents if these murmur against Communism. I mean this facetious, in the eyes of these youngsters, of the shining glamour of a virtue. Moreover, Communist party members the world over, are taught that any means whatever that will further the Cause become lawful by that very fact. We have the H. H. Holmes or Whitlaker Chambers for that. Thus, murder, adultery, teachers of any kind, when it serves the purpose, must not be considered as something wrong, but right. I wonder if the C. I. C. notices any resemblance between this crude perversion of all moral values we quote and cite, by the Communists on the one hand, and the more veiled and polished but eventually identical and equally diabolical principles advocated by that little group of psychiatrists whom we were told and still were expressing an important point of view."

Freedom of speech is to be preserved at all costs, true. But just how chaotic can a person's thinking become when that twisted philosophy of life we all so cruelly detest in the Communists, is then blindly broadcast over our own national network into our own homes and at our expense, and those who point out the grotesqueness of the situation are told not to be narrow minded bigots, that this is academic freedom. Surely, this is nothing but reason gone mad and an excellent case for a bit of applied psychiatry.

CONCLUSION:

Catholics have seldom needed the aid of psychiatry. Because, in spite of all the cases of genuine inhibitions and complexes, the fact

remains that the majority of man's ills are the result of sin, original or personal. In this regard, Catholics have a wonderful safety valve in Confession. There is nothing so real and terrible as the remorse and guilt that follow upon sin. If that moral pressure were allowed to build up within the human soul, sooner or later, it would erupt in countless complexes, frustrations and the rest. The daily suicides, the unending stream of people consulting psychiatrists in America, are proof enough that the human heart cannot abide to have its own misery locked up within itself forever.

Our Blessed Lord knew that. He, the Divine Psychiatrist, knew the needs of our human hearts. That is why He instituted Confession to take care of the great majority of the evils that beset man's soul. For the genuine ills of the human mind, He gave us psychiatry, a valid science and when properly used, a great aid in man's eternal quest for true peace of soul.

God Bless You.

J. M. J. A. M.

MARCH 12th, 1952

QUESTION BOX.

14.

QUESTION:

"WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE CATHOLIC BIBLE AND ANY OTHER BIBLE?"

ANSWER:

There are many differences, some not too important, some very important. For example, since the Catholic and non-Catholic Bibles are different translations of the Hebrew and Greek, they are worded differently, for one thing. Then too, the Catholic Bible spells words differently in some cases. Thus for example, one book in the Catholic Bible is called the Book of Isaiah, whereas in the non-Catholic Bible it is called the Book of Isian. The Catholic Bible calls the last book in the Bible, the Apocalypse, whereas the same book in the non-Catholic version is called the Book of Revelations. All these and many other are minor differences between the Catholic and non-Catholic Bibles, and as such, they are not too important. I might add in passing that the Catholic Bible strives for accuracy and fidelity.

ty in translation. That is why, until very recently, its English has been anything but elegant in style and composition. On the other hand, the non-Catholic Bible, whose very beautiful English writing, has been anything but accurate from a critical point of view.

The great difference between the two bibles, of course, is the fact that the Old Testament in the Catholic Bible contains seven books that have been left out of the non-Catholic Bible. These books are Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, 1st and 2nd Maccabees and parts of Esther and Daniel. Why were these books dropped from the non-Catholic Bible? Because for a while, there had been some doubt about whether or not they were really inspired. But when the Catholic Church in 197 A. D. put together the Bible as we know it today, and decided which book belonged in the Bible and which did not, she definitely included those seven books. It was only 400 years ago at the time of the Reformation, that Martin Luther rejected them and decided to call them apocrypha. What is not so well known, is that he also threw out of the Bible he made up, the present day Epistle of St. James, because St. James made it crystal clear that we are saved by good works and not by faith alone. This did not please Martin Luther and so rejected the entire book calling it "an epistle of straw." A hundred years later, his followers put it back in the Bible where it belonged. I understand there is also a movement afoot to put the other seven books back into the Bible where they also belong.

These are the main differences between the Catholic and non-Catholic Bibles.

QUESTION.

"DOES THE CATHOLIC BIBLE IN ANY LESSON GIVE A STATEMENT ON PURGATORY?"

ANSWER:

The word "Purgatory" is not in the Bible, just as the word "Bible" itself is not there. But, the teaching about Purgatory is to be found in quite a few places in the Bible. One of the seven books thrown out of the Bible by Martin Luther and to which reference was made in the previous question, is the 2nd Book of Maccabees. In its 12th Chapter, it tells of how the Jews sent offerings to Jerusalem to have prayers said for the souls of their fellow-Jews who had fallen in battle. Then, it goes on to say "It is therefore a holy and a whole-

some thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins' (Mach. 12: 43-46). Now, even if some do not wish to admit that this book is the inspired word of God, they must at least admit that it does record the plain, historical fact of the Jewish custom of praying for their dead. In the New Testament, the idea that the Christian dead, though saved by the death of Our Lord, still owed much to the justice of God before they could be considered perfect enough to enter heaven, is evident in several places. See for example Matt. 5: 26 Matt. 12: 32 1 Cor. 3: 11-15.

These are but some of the Scripture texts that refer to Purgatory. If taken together with the Church's great Tradition concerning Purgatory, as well as the evidence that can be found in the catacombs even to this day, the testimony of the early Fathers and the magnificent prayers of the primitive liturgies of Christianity — once you take all these together, I say there is not the slightest reasonable doubt about the existence of Purgatory. Some years ago, I gave a talk on Purgatory. I think it would do no harm at all to give another one.

RADIO BROADCAST.

16.

"The Catholic Church and Purgatory"

Dear Radio Friends

Many people have asked me of late to give a talk on Purgatory. One such talk was given some years ago on this programme. But, I am glad to go back over the Church's teaching on Purgatory, because not only is it one of the most beautiful and consoling truths of the faith for Catholics, many non-Catholics, while claiming to reject it in theory, nevertheless feel themselves strongly drawn to it in practice. And no wonder! For not only is it true. It is most natural and probable that it should be so.

What exactly do Catholics believe about Purgatory? The Church teaches and Catholics believe that: Purgatory is a place where souls suffer for a time after death on account of their sins. Notice how guarded and accurate is the Church's teaching on the matter. What is of faith is: 1. That there is a Purgatory. 2. that some suffer there after death for their sins, and 3) we can help to relieve their sufferings. Remember, this is the professed belief of the Catholic Church the world over and right back through the centuries to Christ.

From the doctrine of Purgatory, some other truths follow as perfectly certain, though not formally defined as articles of faith. For example, the souls in Purgatory are definitely saved and they know it. They can never lose the state of grace. But until they are perfectly purified from their sins and the ravages of sin, they cannot behold God face to face. This temporary loss of the vision of God is what constitutes for them, their main suffering and purification. They love God and long for Him. Yet, they feel and know that they are not yet worthy to possess Him and so they want to be purged or cleansed of every last shadow of sin, that they may then fly to God and be with Him and enjoy Him forevermore. It is also the common teaching that the souls in Purgatory suffer the pain of sense, some positive suffering through fire. That, briefly, is Purgatory.

Now, why do Catholics believe in Purgatory? What proofs does the Church bring forth when commanding the ascent of the Faithful? There are three parts to the proof. First we may allow to put it that way. 1. Belief in Purgatory is most reasonable, in fact it is the only solution that satisfies our reason. 2. It is based on the Holy Scriptures, and 3. The great Tradition of the whole Christian Church confirms it so abundantly as to put it beyond the shadow of a doubt. Let us take them one at a time.

A. REASON

The doctrine of Purgatory is not only most reasonable, it is the only answer that will satisfy reason. How is that? Well, the Apocalypse tells us plainly that the human soul must be absolutely perfect before it can be adjoined to the presence of God. Nothing defiled it sees and enters there (Apoc. 21:27). On the other hand, only the damned are bad enough to deserve hell. That is, those who die at deadly sins with God in mortal sin. Now, what happens to the man who at death is fit for neither heaven nor hell? He dies with no great crime on his soul that would condemn him to hell, yet neither is he perfectly free from those smaller sins into which even the best of people sometimes fall. He cannot enter heaven, he is not perfect yet, by any means. But equally certain is it that he is not bad enough to be condemned to hell. What, then, is the only proper place for such a man's soul? Purgatory! Wherein he will be purified and cleansed and made ready for heaven.

Now some object and say: Oh, but such a man was cleansed, because he put all his faith in Christ and accepted Him as his personal redeemer, the Blood of Christ cleansed him from all sin. Now, those are certainly convincing words. But have a good look at them. We all admit that the Blood of Christ washes away the guilt of all sins of which a man is guilty and for which he is sorry. Every body admits that I say. But — and here is the crux of the matter — what happens to a man, Catholic or non-Catholic, who dies not sorry for some small sin? Maybe he is not sorry for some small impatience or uncharitableness and death overtakes him that way. Not all the Blood of Christ can take away even a single sin, however small, if a man is not sorry for it. On the other hand, to say that God would send such a man to hell because of some unrepented small sin, would be to make a monster out of God. Purgatory is the only

This strange idea that all believers in Christ are somehow automatically and miraculously changed into the purest angels at the split second of death, is just a nice fancy bit of pure imagination. The physical act of dying can of itself, work no spiritual change whatever in the soul. Therefore, since the overwhelming majority of mankind is wicked, is perfect at death as to merit to see God immediately and enjoy His love — not so bad as to deserve to be damned forever in hell — there is only one answer that will satisfy reason: Purgatory, that place or state where those are detained who, though saved, are not yet purified enough or ready to be ushered in to the unspeakable presence of the all pure God.

B. PURGATORY — SCRIPTURE.

At this point, some will say "Granted the existence of purgatory is reasonable, in fact it even appears necessary. But are there any indications in the Bible that support it?" There most certainly are. You will not find the word "purgatory" there, but the doctrine is definitely in the Bible. There is no explicit text in the Bible for Infant Baptism either, or for the number of the sacraments. The very books of the Bible are nowhere named or listed. So, not all that Jesus Christ taught is fully or plainly expressed in the New Testament. But it is there implicitly, it is often hinted at or implied, or it follows logically from some doctrine that is clearly stated.

As far as Purgatory is concerned, we begin with the classical text in 2 Mach. 12: 43-46 verse. It is therefore, a holy and a wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins. Now, some people like to deny that this book is inspired, they call it one of the Apocryphals. However even if that were so, — which it is not — the critics would still have to admit that as an historical record, this book is genuine and trustworthy, that it shows the time honored custom of the Jews throughout centuries before Christ of praying for their departed. Our Lord condemned outright any corruptions of the faith or morals introduced by the Pharisees. Never once did He reprove or condemn the practice of praying for the dead. In fact, by His silence, He approved it. And to this very day, the Jewish Church continues to pray for its departed members.

In the 12th Chapter of St. Matt. Our Lord says of a certain

sins, that it shall be forgiven neither in this world nor in the world to come. It is striking to see how St. Augustine and other eminent commentators infer from this, that some sins apparently will be forgiven in the world to come. Since this cannot happen either in heaven or in hell, it can only refer to what we understand by Purgatory.

Think of Purgatory and you can also see the sense in St. Paul's words when he says in I Cor. 3rd Chapter, 11th-15th verse, that 'fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is' and that the man 'himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.' Where is that fire? Certainly not in heaven or on earth and most certainly not in hell, for that fire torments and does not save.

I could quote many other passages of Scripture. They may at times be debatable in themselves, but the Catholic Church feels wonderful assurance when she sees how the unanimous voice of the Fathers of Christendom supports her stand. You have only to consult the writings of such great men as Origen, St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and others of like authority. There is no doubt about how the early Christians and their writers felt about Purgatory.

C. TRADITION.

To settle the whole matter, we have but to consult the simply overwhelming mass of Tradition—the very first century writings in the catacombs under the slaughter houses of the pagan aemulii. Inscriptions on the walls read: 'Peace with thee, Lani. May thy spirit rest in God. May God refresh thee. May thy spirit rest well in God. Pray for the sister. Mayest thou live in peace and pray for us.' Go to Rome. Dear Friends and read these inscriptions for yourselves. From the first to the fifth century they cover Lutetia to the dying St. Monica as she begs her son, St. Augustine: 'Lay this body anywhere, let not the care of it in any way disturb you. This only I request of you that wherever you may be you would remember me at the altar of the Lord.'

These I say, are but a few examples. Whole volumes of similar testimony could be given showing the belief of the very first Christians with regard to the beautiful and consoling doctrine of Purgatory. The Fathers of the Church could be cited over and over again. The primitive liturgies, such as those of St. James in Jerusalem, St. Mark in Alexandria, St. Peter in Rome, St. Basil and St. John

Chrysostom in Constantinople — all ranging from the second to the fifth centuries — all say in different words, the identical prayer that is still found in the Mass Missal of the Universal Catholic Church today: "Remember, O Lord, thy servants who are gone before us with the sign of the Lark and who sleep in peace. To these, O Lord, and to all who rest in Christ, grant, we beseech thee, a place of refreshment, light and peace, through the same Jesus Christ, Our Lord."

CONCLUSION.

That, then, is what we mean by Purgatory — our praying for our dear departed ones, that God in His mercy, may soon bring them to heaven. You know, there is something terribly inhuman in the idea that denies purgatory. Why should we be cut off from our dear ones by death? Does death block them out completely? Are they beyond our help and prayer? We loved them so dearly and tenderly in life. Why, in the name of all that is sane, should we suddenly be cut off from them in every way by death? In death we loved them, I say. But surely we did not deceive ourselves into thinking that they were absolutely perfect at that moment. That is why our whole soul rises up against this inhuman idea that we cannot help them with our prayers. That is why, with the whole Christian and Catholic Church down the ages, Catholics pray over and over again to our Dear Lord and Merciful God: "Eternal rest grant unto them, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon them." Amen.

God Bless You

J. M. J. A. M.

MARCH 19th, 1932

QUESTION BOX.

1A.

QUESTION

"CATHOLICS OFTEN INVITE THEIR NON-CATHOLIC FRIENDS TO CATHOLIC CHURCH SERVICES. WHY, THEN, DON'T THEY RETURN THE COMPLIMENT AND GO TO NON-CATHOLIC SERVICES WHEN INVITED?"

That is a good question. Sometimes, our non-Catholic friends are hurt when we tell them that Catholics cannot go to their church services with them. Now, why are they not allowed to go? Here is the answer. On every other subject under the sun Catholics admit with everyone else that there is always something new to learn. We can never say that we have discovered everything there is to discover. Thus in the field of medicine there will always be new methods of doing things, new inventions, new techniques to cure disease. The same holds for law, business and everything else. We can never say that we have discovered all there is to learn in these affairs.

But in the realm of religion it is different. Catholics believe that Jesus Christ gave them that He gave them a definite body of teachings to believe and a very definite manner of life by which to live. That we believe is the whole of Christianity. There is nothing more in the way of Christian truths to be discovered. Christ gave us the whole truth about God and heaven and our soul's salvation. That complete or perfect body of truth Catholics call the Faith. We believe that God founded a Church, his infallible teaching Church, to give that learned Faith whole and entire to all men in all generations right down to the end of the world. The Church divinely protected from error in this regard gives Catholics that truth of Christ today. Therefore Catholics are not seeking truth; they believe they have it. They are not shopping around for religious truth, for some new revelation for something extra over and above what Our Lord gave. They believe they have it whole and entire, and that there is no need, therefore, to seek it elsewhere. In a word, therefore a Catholic, in his own definition, a person who is convinced he has the truth. If he is not convinced, he is just not a Catholic. You can see now why a Catholic can and does invite everyone else to come to the Catholic Church. He is convinced that in the Catholic Church alone will be found the whole truth and he hopes that everyone will want to share that total truth with him since it belongs to them as well as to him.

For the very same reason he has no desire to go to non-Catholic churches, which he believes contain at best only part of the truth. For him to attend such services and take an active part in them, would amount to an implicit denying that he had found the

whole truth in the Catholic Church. That is why a Catholic can never attend a non-Catholic religious service and take an active part in it. It would be a denying of his own Catholic Faith.

QUESTION:

"SHOULD PEOPLE ASK TO GO TO CONFESSION BEFORE THE HIGH MASS ON SUNDAY MORNING?"

ANSWER:

Every priest who has the care of souls is bound to hear the confessions of the faithful when their request is reasonable. Now, Sunday morning is just about the worst time of the week for the priest. He has Masses to say and perhaps several sermons to preach. Yet, in spite of everything, he tries to give everyone a chance to go to confession. On your side, the laity, please remember this: Try to go to confession on Saturday. If you live in town, where there's a resident priest. In the country come early. Many people come at the last possible moment, then line up to go to confession and the result is that the priest has to hold up Mass for a half hour or even an hour — which is simply not fair to those who have to sit in church and wait while the others go to confession. Moreover, it makes the priest just that much later to begin the next Mass in the next Masson station. So, let everyone try to be reasonable and cooperate with the priest as much as possible.

RADIO THOUGHT

16.

"The Catholic Church and Business."

Dear Radio Friends:

It is often taken for granted that religion and business have little or nothing in common. Men of the world often like to say in one form or another: "His religion is all right for Sunday morning in church. But in the cold, competitive, cut-throat world of business, it is every man for himself. And you had better get the drop on the other fellow before he gets it on you. These and similar thoughts often color the thinking and therefore the actions of business men. Hence the expression: "Business is business and keep the Ten Commandments out of it."

Now the Catholic Church refuses to take the hint. She insists on telling the whole world the principles of justice laid down by God in the moral law. The Church is not very popular for doing this. She has been attacked and ostracized from a most every conceivable quarter of the business world. She has been reviled by Capitalism as being the tool of Communism, and by Communism as being the tool of Capitalism. Capital has attacked her as being pro-Labor and Labor has complained that she is pro-Capital. Now, when an institution is thus attacked from all sides and from opposite extremes, not only the chances but the probabilities are that that institution stands right in the sensible middle, refusing to be dragged to either or any extreme. And that is exactly the Church's stand with regard to business. Just as she endorses no political form of government as being universally suitable to all people, neither does she put her stamp of approval on any single economic system as being the only ideal and perfect one for all the world.

Everyone knows that the Catholic Church is the number one enemy of Communism. But because the Church is the deadly foe of atheistic Communism, it does not follow that the Church is therefore friendly in fact with Capitalism. Nothing could be further from the

truth. Even Communism has its good points. Its announced goal of freeing the workers of the world from the slavery of big business monopolies is a good goal in itself. Only Communism has no intention whatever of freeing the worker from slavery at such an inhuman transfer his slavery from Big Business to the Abominable Tyrannical State. Moreover Communism's denial of man's basic right to private property, its militant abolition of the total possession of all means of values in the service of the Cause — all these more than merit the Church's outright condemnation of Communism.

From all this however, let Capitalism not presume to sit back in smug complacency, deceiving itself with the illusion that it is the ideal system. Capitalism is anything but perfect. It too has its good points. But still human hands must guide modern Capitalism before, in the full light of man's basic private property. It believes in free enterprise, in initiative and supports this in the dignity of the human person. And certainly no one in his right senses will deny that the spirit of competition, albeit in its entirety gone as well as the profit motive involved — no one I say, will deny for a moment that these things have contributed enormously to man of incentive to the material development and progress of the capitalist countries including our Canada. But neither will anyone in his right senses deny that the very same profit motive and spirit of competition have also been the cause of great much greed on the part of capitalists and monopolies, avarice and surplus profits that in the past have reached staggering proportions. These have always been the abuses of Capitalism.

Capitalism was always by open to such abuses, because the Capitalist is a man, even as the Worker is a man. And a man — any man — is the inheritor of a fallen nature that is prone to evil. Love, profits and the thrill of power have always sounded a siren call for all Capitalists from the smallest business man to the great tycoons and captains of industry. We see this in all its ugliness in the last century when the abuses of Capitalism reached their peak in that particularly heinous greed that went under the name of "rugged individualism." It was not merely rugged, it was absolutely ruthless in its tyranny over the working class.

Things have come a long way since then, thanks in no small part to the great Encyclical document of Pope Leo XIII in the last century his *Rerum Novarum* as it was called — "On the Condition of Labor." That encyclical letter was and still is perhaps the

greatest pioneering charter on the proper relations between Capital and Labor. In it the paper stated clearly the functions, rights and duties of both Capital and Labor in the light of God's eternal justice. We have time to touch on only the most important features of that document and even then only briefly.

A. CAPITAL

First of all Capital Every man has the right to be a Capitalist, since the right to own private property is inherent in the very nature of man. Every private person may expand his Capitalism to the public at large and go into business. But the moment he does, he takes on further responsibilities as justice before God, to serve the public, to charge reasonable prices for his goods, to pay a just living wage to his employees, and to be satisfied himself with a reasonable profit from his business.

Now anyone who knows the history of Capitalism also knows how flagrantly these considerations were violated during the whole open era of unrestrained Capitalism. The employer was everything, the employee nothing. Inhuman hours, intolerable working conditions, starvation wages—all went hand in hand until the worker became a veritable slave of the factory owner. If the worker objected he was fined and blacklisted and he and his family starved. Meanwhile the employer whose greatest boast was that he was a rugged independence fattened on the sweat of the laborer and on his many factored goods, hanged all that the traffic would bear. We all know the tremendous fight labor has had to put up to come into its own. It has been something of an epic. But thanks to that long, courageous struggle we now have minimum wage laws, insurance plans, 40-hour weeks, we have minimum decent working conditions and in and large a just living wage. What is far more important, however, is the fact that Big Business has now come to realize that not only is it right to deal with the worker fairly, it is also good business. In short Capitalism, over the years has become more or less human, though much remains to be done.

B. LABOR

In its turn, Labor also has its duties and responsibilities. Every man has the right to work, to a just living wage and decent working conditions. Moreover all workers have the basic right to organize

into labor unions. In fact, many would say that they even have a duty to do so.

Furthermore, labor also has the right to strike. But only after every other lawful means of negotiating has been tried and failed. Moreover, the workers have no right to go on strike if the public good of society at large were to suffer damage and harm out of all proportion to the good sought for by the strikers. Because you see, the public or common good of society as a whole always comes before the private good of any individual or group of individuals. If Labor has a right to a just living wage, then Labor must remember that that same right always comes with it the moral obligation before God to earn that living wage by doing a full day's work.

Finally, when it is the ideal arrangement for workers and management to share in the profits of their industry, it must be stated clearly that labor has no right in nature to such profits of ownership—provided always of course that the workers are receiving a just living wage for the work they do. Once that just living wage is paid the workers, they have no claim in nature to the profits of industry since those belong to the owners of industry and not to the workers. These have already been paid justly and sufficiently for their work. The ideal of course always remains. And that is, that the best and happiest arrangement is for owners and workers to share in some equitable manner, the fruits of industry in general.

CONCLUSION:

The whole field of labor relations is a vastly complicated one. But the Catholic Church insists that, however complicated it may be, both Capital and Labor are bound by the laws of justice. Both have duties as well as rights. Nor can either group afford to ignore such duties. As long as they do, there will be labor trouble. The owner or Capitalist has a dignity all his own. So has the laborer. Only when both respect each other, and act accordingly in their business relations, will Capital and Labor know peace which is the fruit of Justice.

God Bless You

QUESTION BOX.

16.

QUESTION

"DID ST JOSEPH AND COUNTLESS OTHER SOULS RISE TO HEAVEN WITH OUR LORD ON ASCENSION DAY?"

ANSWER:

Yes, that is an ancient tradition in the Church. After His death on the cross, the soul of Christ descended to the "prison" mentioned by St. Peter in his first Epistle, 3rd Chapter. Scripture says that Our Lord preached or spoke to the souls of all the just who had died before the Redemption and were awaiting the opening of heaven to them. This is the "prison" or limbo referred to when we say in the Apostles' Creed, "He descended into hell." And on Ascension Day, Our Lord entered heaven in triumph with this company of blessed souls.

QUESTION

"HOW LONG AFTER CHRISTMAS DID THE MAGI COME TO ADORE THE CHRIST-CHILD?"

ANSWER:

About two years. Thus we have from Tradition and from the fact that in Scripture, it is recorded that Herod ordered the massacre of all the male infants in Bethlehem, two years of age and under.

QUESTION

"MAY WE HAVE MASS SAID FOR NON-CATHOLICS?"

ANSWER:

The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass may be celebrated — but privately only — for the repose of the souls of deceased non-Catholics. Usually this happens in the case of relatives and friends. For those who are alive, Mass may also be offered — but again only privately — and in this latter case, the further intention should be included

in all charity, namely, that they may soon return to the Faith of their Fathers.

QUESTION

"DOES THE LAW OF FASTING ALLOW A LUNCH BEFORE BED-TIME?"

ANSWER.

Remember, first of all, that all Catholics, 21 to 59, are bound by the law of fasting, unless legitimately excused or dispensed. Now, to answer your question. If by a lunch you mean the eating of solids such as food, the answer is No, you are not allowed to eat lunch. If, on the other hand, you mean only liquids, such as milk, fruit juices and so on, they are allowed in almost all dioceses and therefore you may have that kind of a lunch before retiring. Actually, it amounts to more of a drink than a lunch.

QUESTION.

"WHAT ARE THE SINS AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST?"

ANSWER

There is only one sin against the Holy Ghost and that is the sin called refusing the grace of God. God the Holy Ghost is the Sanctifier of souls and therefore when a person in sin refuses the inspirations and graces that God sends him, he is really spurning the mercy of God. That is why it is called sinning against the Holy Ghost. If this hardness in sin and refusal to repent lasts right till the very moment of death, the soul is lost. In that case, this permanent spurning of God's mercy is called the sin of final impenitence.

QUESTION:

"ARE THERE ANY SINS NOT FORGIVEN IN THIS WORLD?"

ANSWER:

No sin can possibly be forgiven unless the sinner repents. As long therefore, as a person repents, there is no possible sin that cannot be forgiven. The only unforgivable sin, consequently, is the sin of refusing to be sorry for sin.

QUESTION.

"WHY IS A RELIGIOUS VOCATION CONSIDERED A HIGHER CALLING THAN THAT OF THE MARRIED OR SINGLE STATE?"

ANSWER.

In all states of life, religious, married and single, people are serving and loving God when they try to fulfill their duties sincerely and conscientiously and for all those in their proper state of life, that state is best for them. However, in any comparison of these states of life taken purely as states of life, the religious state or vocation emerges superior to either the married or the single state, because of the manner in which God is served. In marriage, a person is promised to his or her spouse; in single life, a person still lives in the world and may still enjoy its lawful pleasures. On the other hand, however, those in the religious state, have not only given up the lawful pleasures of the world out of love for God; they have freely sacrificed even the human love of marriage that their hearts may be completely and entirely consecrated to God and His service. It was this total and undivided dedication of one's whole life and efforts in religion that long ago prompted those well-known words of St. Paul: "He that is without a wife is solicitous for the things of the Lord: how he may please God. But he that is with a wife is solicitous for the things of the world: how he may please his wife. And he is divided" (1 Cor 7: 32, 33).

RADIO BROADCAST.

17.

"The Catholic Church and our Lady."

Dear Radio Friends:

Tonight I want to talk to you about Our Lady. It's a subject, you know, about which the Catholic Church never tires of talking. Because you see, Our Lady is pretty grand. In fact, after God, we love her more than anyone, she's that wonderful. And all the warmth and love and devotion with which Catholics have always surrounded Our Lady — all that, I say, has ever been the hallmark of the Christian Faith.

Sometimes, of course, non-Catholics think that we honor Our Lady too much, that we even put her above Our Lord Himself, or at least on the same footing with Him. In short, they feel that we somehow make a goddess out of her. And for that reason, they have tried to counterbalance what they believe to be Catholic over-emphasis by going to the opposite extreme of under-emphasis. They have more or less ignored Mary. I have run into some truly good and wonderful people, who tried to tell me that Our Lady was — well, you know, just another good woman and that's all, nothing to get excited about, so to speak. In fact, they barely begrudged her a sort of nodding recognition and not much else.

So, tonight I want to show you what the Church of God really believes about the Blessed Virgin Mary — the true Christian teaching about Our Lady right from the beginning. That way, you will see why we love and honor her so much.

A. MARY — ONLY A CREATURE.

First of all, Mary never was, is not now and never shall be anything else but a creature. She is only a human being like ourselves. She is one of us. Therefore, Mary is in no sense God: she is not divine or a goddess in any conceivable way, shape or form. Is that clear? I cannot possibly make it any clearer than that. Therefore, Catholics do not adore the Blessed Virgin Mary — they never have

and never will. If they did they would be guilty of idolatry and blasphemy at once: men that are in opposition to the sight of God. So, we do not and never shall adore Mary. Eventually she is only a creature and as such there is an infinite distance between God and Mary: just as there is between God and any other creature. God is God and Mary is only one of His creatures.

2 DIVINE MATERNITY

Now, once you have that all important fact and basic truth deeply established, the rest is easy: it follows simply and beautifully. Once you agree to recognize Mary as only a creature then there is nothing too wonderful that you can say about her. Within the limits of creaturehood if I may put it that way, and above within those limits, we simply cannot praise Mary too much. She is dearer and holier and more wonderful in the sight of God than the rest of creation put together: angels, saints and men. Why do I say that? I, that am an imagination. No, I am not. Because no matter how much we honor Mary, God has already honored her unspcakably more when He chose her to be His Mother (imagine: A creature, chosen by God to give birth to God's own divine Son: Can we ever possibly begin to understand what that means? That Jesus Christ the eternal Son of God, should take His all-pure flesh from her flesh, His all-pure blood from her blood. That she, only a creature, *engender* should be so privileged as to carry God's own Son within her, to give birth to him nine months later, that she should nurse Him, feed and clothe Him and rear Him even as you good mothers raise your own sons, that Mary should do all this. I say, and for whom? For no mere man, however holy, no, not even an angel even the highest of angels, but for whom? Let her do it, for the Father and God Himself. And then someone has the simple staggering to audacity to get up and tell me that Mary was a good woman and a saint, that withing very much out of the ordinary to get excited about. Saints that one must take the supreme prize for dunning a person with faint praise.

Where in the history of all mankind, has there ever been anyone like her? Jesus Christ of course is God and Him we adore. He, the Son, is infinitely greater and above the Mother. In fact there simply is no comparison between Jesus and Mary, since He is God and she is only a creature. But among all those who are purely creatures, who is like to her? What other woman in all the annals of

history ever had an angel sent by God address her "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou among women" (Luke 1:28). What other woman could ever stand above the world and under the direct inspiration of God Himself sing as Mary did, in her own glorious Magnificat recorded in the Bible. My soul doth magnify the Lord and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my saviour. For He that is mighty hath done great things in me: and behold, henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. (Luke 1:46-55)

That then is the whole source of Mary's glory: that God chose her to be the Mother of His Son, Jesus. And because Jesus was to take His all pure flesh from her flesh, His all pure blood from her blood, God kept her immaculate and in her own conception, would not allow the slightest breath of sin to taint her perfect, immaculate soul. That is what you mean by Our Lady's Immaculate Conception. And when she died, God would not let that same pure body of hers know the corruption of the grave. That is what you mean by her Assumption into heaven. *

C. PERPETUAL VIRGINITY:

All of which brings us to Mary's Perpetual Virginity. Mary was always a Virgin, before, during and forever after the birth of Christ. She had no child but Jesus. The very idea that she would have had other children after the birth of Our Lord, is close to blasphemy. Every one of those expressions in the Bible, referring to Jesus as Mary's "firstborn" and to the famous "brethren", or "brothers and sisters of the Lord" — all these cause no difficulty whatever to anyone who knows the idioms of the Hebrew language of the time. For example, an only son was always called the "firstborn," even though there were no others after him (See Ex. 13:2 and 34:19). As for the brethren of Our Lord, that need not refer at all, to actual blood brothers or sisters. Jewish families were particularly clanish and all relatives, however distant, were referred to as "brethren", since there simply was no word for "cousin" in either the Hebrew or Aramaic languages.

What carries overwhelming weight, however, is the testimony of all the Fathers of the Church. It was not till the 3rd century that Tertullian tried to cast doubts on Mary's perpetual virginity. A century later, Helvidius tried the same thing and the whole of Christian tradition answered him. In fact, do you know that all those

objections concerning the "brethren" of the Lord, were brought up and simply answered by St. Jerome as far back as the 4th century. But, there is something else, still — to me, one of the most convincing arguments of all. It is the reasoning of the Fathers of the Church. "What kind of a woman would Mary have been anyway?" They ask, if she had gone ahead and had other children after having had Our Lord? Here, God had singled her out among all women on earth for the unspeakable honor of giving birth to His eternal Son. Miraculously she had conceived Him by the Holy Ghost, miraculously was He born. In a word, Mary's whole body was sanctified, consecrated and dedicated forever by the very fact that God had deigned to dwell within her. What kind of a woman would she have been, then, if, after so unspeakable an honor, she had gone on to have more children the ordinary way, with a mere man? Would it not have been an insult to the Holy Ghost who had sanctified her womb? Is it not an insult to Mary herself, to suggest that she would have been so callous about the whole affair? That is why Catholics, with the whole Church and Christian tradition, have always upheld Mary's title of Ever-Virgin.

6. INTERCESSION.

Fourth, we come to one more question about Mary. Why do Catholics pray to her, since the Bible says plainly that Our Lord is our One and Only Mediator (1 Tim. 2:5)? Here is the answer: Jesus Christ and He alone, is our one and only Mediator. He alone paid the full price God's justice demanded for our sins. So, Jesus Christ alone is our only Mediator of Justice. Mary depends entirely on Him and without Him, or independently of Our Lord, neither Mary nor the saints can so much as lift a finger to help us. Now, to answer the question: Why, then, do we pray to Mary, instead of praying directly to God? Well, I think the whole difficulty in understanding why Catholics pray to Mary lies in this: Do we all understand the same thing by the expression "To pray to someone"? If to pray to someone meant that we adored them or treated them as gods, or set them up in opposition to Christ, then Catholics would indeed be guilty of idolatry when they prayed to Mary. But that's not what praying to a person means at all! To pray to someone simply means to ask their help, to ask them to give a hand, to do you a favour. "I pray you" runs through the whole of the

English language. Remember Shakespeare: "Prithce do this or that" "Pray, come here." Remember how, during the war, soldiers, non-Catholic as well as Catholic, asked their mothers and dear ones to pray for them that they might come back safe and sound. And their mothers said: "I'll pray for you every day while you're away." What were their mothers doing, except meditating with God for their sons. They simply added their prayers to those of their sons. Did that fact militate against Christ's still being our one and only Mediator? Of course not. Now simply transfer that whole idea to Our Lady and the saints too, if you will. They are God's nearest and dearest. So, Catholics simply beg them in heaven to add their powerful prayers to ours — we who are poor sinners. In a way, I suppose it might be better if we all said 'pray with' instead of 'pray to' — since that 'pray to' seems to be a mental hazard for many outside the Church. But Catholics know what is meant, of course, and they never forget that Mary and the saints depend entirely upon the merits of Christ Our Lord, who remains always, our one and only Mediator of Justice with God.

CONCLUSION

There, then, is Our Lady. Do you see now, why we love her so much? The Church has always felt, and rightly so, too, that in praising His Mother, we are really praising God. Nothing is too good for her as long as we keep our facts about her straight. On the other hand, however, it has always seemed to us terribly and tragically sad, that anyone should tell Our Lord he loved them while at the same time ignoring Our Lord's mother. If anyone did that to you or to me, I don't think we'd like it either. That is why we all hope for the day when all men will come back to Mary and let her lead them to her Divine Son, Jesus. And, you know, I somehow feel that day is not too far off.

God Bless You.

QUESTION BOX.

17.

QUESTION.

'ARE CATHOLICS BETWEEN THE AGES OF 7 AND 20 ALLOWED TO EAT MEAT MORE THAN ONCE A DAY ON DAYS WHICH ARE NOT ABSTINENCE DAYS?'

ANSWER.

The answer is: Yes.

QUESTION.

"WHAT ARE WE TO THINK ABOUT THIS BUSINESS OF ANTI-CHRIST BEING BORN IN 1952? ABOUT HIS EVENTUALLY COMING INTO GREAT POWER? ABOUT HIS ABILITY TO WORK MIRACLES AND SO ON? THERE SEEMS TO BE A GREAT DEAL OF TALK ABOUT IT NOWADAYS."

ANSWER.

There certainly is a great deal of talk about it all — in fact, far too much. To anyone who knows history, this whole business is ironical in the extreme. Less than a hundred years ago, the Catholic Church was just about the only one who firmly defended the whole supernatural world and miracles, in the midst of a world that had gone crazy over science and insisted that science could do anything and was the universal cure for all man's evils. Today, a hundred years later the inevitable reaction has set in and people, seeing that science is only a tremendous force which can be used to destroy man as well as to help him, — people, I say, are only too ready to grasp anything that looks like the supernatural. So much so, indeed, that the Church now has to warn people the other way, against false supernaturalism. Or to put it another way, years ago people were not ready enough to believe: now they are far too ready to believe anything. It is nothing, of course, but the natural reaction to centuries of syncretism and stultifying agnosticism. But the reaction itself needs to be watched. Take this anti-Christ business. Our Lord told

us in the Bible about false prophets and false prophecies and all the rest of that sort of thing, that they would work dazzling so-called "miracles" to deceive, if possible, even the elect. Now, we know that anti-Christ will come towards the end of the world. But when exactly, what year, nobody knows. Thereafter, those prophecies that say that anti-Christ will be born in 1952 and so on, may be true, but the probabilities are all against it. Moreover the Church has never given her official support to any prophecy that would pin down the coming of anti-Christ or the end of the world to any particular year. God has revealed nothing about a particular date. Therefore the Church does not know anything about it and neither does anyone else for that matter. So, if you want to believe that anti-Christ was or will be born this year, you are perfectly free to do so. But I think you are very foolish if you do. All this sort of thing may make interesting reading, but remember, I have no approval whatever from the Church.

RADIO BROADCAST.

III

"The Catholic Church and Sorrow."

Dear Radio Friends:

Holy Week is surely an appropriate time to talk to you about sorrow. For this week, Catholics throughout the world join with Holy Mother Church in recalling the passion and death of Our Lord, the Man of Sorrows. Sorrow in itself is always bitter and hard to take. But if we are ever to see it in its true light, it will have to be the light that shines from the cross whereon hangs the Saviour of the world in agony. For then, we see sorrow as God sees it.

Then too, there is another reason for talking about Sorrow during Holy Week. A touch of sorrow, it seems, must come into every life. For some people, it never seems to amount to much more than that, a touch. For others, the shadow of pain and suffering lies heavily upon them, like an overcast sky, and only now and then does the sunlight of joy seem to break through to brighten an otherwise dark and dreary life. Now, a touch of pain is fairly easy to take; a few clouds in an otherwise clear sky are never too much of a burden. But a whole lifetime—or what seems to be a lifetime of sorrow, is not at all easy to accept. An existence that from beginning to end seems to be overcast with nothing but the dull, leaden grey of unbroken sorrow can make even the most courageous heart falter along the way. And it is only in the light of Good Friday and all the tragedy and bitterness that surrounded it, that we can make any sense at all out of sorrow.

A. GOD WILLS EVERYTHING:

Now, if we are ever going to understand the place of sorrow in God's scheme of things, then the first thing we must remember is this: Everything, absolutely everything that happens to us, happens because God wills it. The good things that happen to us, God wills positively and directly. The evil things that befall us are the result

of God's permissive will. He allows evil to happen to us when He could prevent it. Why does God do this? The answer is the classic one given in the whole Book of Job: "If we have received good things at the hand of God, why should we not receive evil?" Job 2:10.

The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away, as it hath pleased the Lord, so it done: blessed be the name of the Lord. Job 1:21.

I mention this because some good people, in an effort to explain why God allows evil in the first place when He could prevent it, have come up with a pretty little system all their own. They have tried to say that God will do all the good things that happen to us, because after all He is our Heavenly Father and loves us. But they mistakenly try to put no God-part in the events of life only in the good things that happen to us. They try to say that God has no part whatsoever in the evil that befall us, such as earthquakes, fires, disease, accidents and the rest. The fact is, however, that God wills even these evils in the sense that He allows them to happen when He could work a miracle and just easily remove or block the evil that may become a disaster. God does not work the miracle. He simply allows the forces of nature to take their course, and as a result you have earthquakes, fires, floods and epidemics that kill off millions of people each year. God has nothing to do with these things, but only in the sense that He allows them to happen when He could prevent them by a miracle. Why God does not choose to suspend the laws of nature which He Himself set up, is a mystery. The best answer is to be found in the Book of Job.

It is necessary to point out that God's will extends even to evil things because to pretend that God has nothing whatever to do with the evils that afflict men would be to withdraw all the events of life from the jurisdiction, will and control of God. It would be to make Him only half a God and therefore no God at all. So just remember that everything that happens to us is willed by God, positively and directly when it is something good and only permissively, as when God allows evils and sorrows to touch our lives.

B. PAIN OF LIFE.

What are the evils of life that cause so much sorrow? Well, it is not difficult to understand God's allowing evil to strike a person who deserves it. For example, some of us can work up too much sympathy for the wild, reckless driver who finally ends up by getting himself killed in an accident. He was asking for it. The same holds

for anyone who deliberately undermines his health by not taking reasonable care of his body. The drunkard can hardly complain to God if drink puts him in an early grave. Nor can the impure person blame anyone but himself if his body is racked with disease. All these cases of evil, together with the attendant sorrow that follows upon them, are I am sure, easy to understand.

But it is when a person is not in any way responsible, when quite on the contrary, he has tried to serve God and lead a good life, then it is hard indeed, to understand why God should allow great sorrow and grief to crush a man's soul. Here, for example, is a farmer who has tried to serve God and live his Catholic faith. Yet, after he has sunk his whole life's savings into his farm and looked forward to a comfortable old age, God allows a disastrous fire to wipe him out completely in half an hour. And as the farmer sits amid the ruins of his life's work, he turns his face towards heaven and he has all he can do to keep the bitterness out of his voice as he asks, Why? Why?

Or again - A childless couple beg God to bless their marriage with at least one son or daughter. When they have almost given up hope, a child is born to them and their joy knows no bounds. Several years later their only child is struck by a car and killed. And the mother, dumb with grief, holds the lifeless body of her child in her arms, and raises resentful eyes to heaven and wants to know, Why, God, why did You have to take her from me? Haven't I tried to love and serve You all my life? Why, then, why? And God seems silent and aloof and far away.

Or a fine, clean-cut young man with a brilliant future ahead of him is the victim of someone's careless stupidity. And he wakes up in the hospital, maimed or paralyzed or crippled for life, his career blighted, his hopes dashed, his life ruined. Why, why does God allow those things to happen?

C. CALVARY AND SORROW:

Yes, indeed, why? You could ask that with a great deal of bitterness and even hatred. I suppose. Many people do. The answer, the only answer, however, is to be found in the tragedy of the Cross. Our Lord was God. Surely, He was innocent if anyone ever was. Yet, during these days of His bitter passion and death, He is the Man of Sorrows. God allowed Him to be crushed in body and soul with the

worst torments possible. Could it be, then, that in the sight of God, pain and sorrow and suffering are not necessarily the stupid, cruel and senseless torments the world believes them to be?

Surely Our Lord Himself loved His Mother Mary. Yet from the very beginning of her association with Jesus in God's plan of Redemption, her heart was crushed by sorrow piled on sorrow, till she has become known to the whole Christian world as the Queen of Seven Sorrows—the sevenfold sorrows that pierced her heart again and again. Can it be that there is something good to be drawn out of the evils of pain and suffering even as God drew our salvation out of the agony of the Cross?

That is the Catholic answer: God we believe allows even those most dear to Him to be crushed by pain and suffering. In fact, that are the ones to whom He usually sends the heaviest crosses of sorrow. Why? Well for one thing to draw them away from the consolations of the world and to teach them to depend on Him entirely. And that is not just familiar flustering logic. We have God's word for that both in Tradition but in the Bible also, that those whom He predestines He made conformable to His Divine Son. And everyone who wants to be a Christian has to learn to take up his cross daily and follow in the footsteps of Him who first trod the royal road of suffering. There is no other way.

CONCLUSION

So, there is the meaning of sorrow. God uses it if we will only let Him, to make us kinder, gentler, more forgiving, more like His own Crucified Son. Most of the true good men and women live out their lives in happiness. But some day the shadow of Calvary falls across their lives—sickness, failure, the loss of a dear one. How will they take it? If they have real faith and a deep, abiding love, they see at once in these things, the shadow of the Crucified One. With the arms of their souls outstretched, they become willing victims of sin, atoning in, with and through their Crucified Saviour, not only for their own sins, but for the sins of sinners who will not help themselves.

Yes you can take the sorrows that come to you in life in one of two ways, the right way or the wrong way. You can let sorrow turn you cold and hard and bitter and cynical. Or you can let it make you "another Christ."

It all depends on you.

God Bless You

QUESTION BOX.

18.

QUESTION

"HOW IS IT THAT WE SAY 'GOD GAVE US FREE-WILL' AND THEN TURN AROUND AND SAY 'WE MUST DO THE WILL OF GOD' ISN'T THAT A CONTRADICTION?"

ANSWER

No, there is no contradiction at all, there. When we say that God gave us free-will, all we mean to say is that God gave us the ability to say yes or no, to do right or wrong. In other words, man is not a machine. He can say no even to God and God Himself will not force man to be good against his will. So, free-will means man's ability, his physical ability, if we may put it that way, to do good or evil. If I decide with my free will, to do wrong, who is going to stop me?

On the other hand, when we say that we must do the will of God, that means our moral obligation to do good and avoid evil. By free-will we can do wrong, we have the physical ability to do evil, but by the will of God we are forbidden to do it, we may not do it. I can go through a red stop light, all I have to do is to step on the gas. But I may not do it because it's against the law.

QUESTION.

"DO CATHOLICS BECOME LESSER CATHOLICS IF THEY ARE NOT MEMBERS OF THE C W L AND THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS?"

ANSWER.

That's a very good question and the answer is: In a sense yes, and in a sense no. Certainly membership in those societies is not necessary at all to be a perfectly good Catholic. After all, the Faith does not depend on being a member of any particular society within the Church. So, from that angle, no one is any less a Catholic for not belonging to them.

But there is very definitely another side to the picture. Every

Catholic, man, woman and child, is bound in conscience to help spread the kingdom of Christ on earth. No one stands alone. And certainly no Catholic can be content merely to save his own soul and be absolutely indifferent about everyone else. So, any Catholic man or woman who could very easily join a society within the Church and do great good, and yet fails to do so simply because he or she cannot be bothered with that sort of thing — that kind of a Catholic is very definitely less a Catholic. There seems to be very little love of neighbor in such a person and his religion is to a great extent a sham.

Even more misguided — it seems to me — is the thinking of those Catholics who will work their heads off for civic societies such as the Red Cross and the Community Chest, work that requires any amount of personal sacrifice of time and effort — and yet, they will flatly refuse to join a parish society on the plea that they simply have no time. Such Catholics, it seems to me, are certainly no credit to the Church and they are very definitely the less Catholics for their attitude of mind. So, by all means, let us join in and help civic societies. But let us never forget that they come second. Charity begins at home.

RADIO BROADCAST.

19.

"The Catholic Church and Joy."

Dear Radio Friends,

Just as Holy Week is the best time to consider the whole question of sorrow in our lives, so Easter Week is surely the best time to consider The Catholic Church and joy. For with all the triumphant Alleluia still in the air, what better time could we find than this to contemplate the joy God meant all of us to have in our hearts.

Now what precisely do we mean by true Christian joy? Well, for one thing it is not the world's idea of joy. The world's idea of joy is pleasure, having a good time. That usually means recreation of some kind such as dancing, parties, movies or sports. Even it is pretty hard for a person who is crippled to indulge in sports, except, perhaps, as a spectator. And it is even more difficult for someone who is bedridden to share in the pleasures of the world. But everyone, whether well or ill, can have true Christian joy in his heart, because that kind of joy simply means a profound happiness, a deep-seated peace where the heart is relaxed and at rest — at rest with God, with one's fellowmen and above all with oneself! I say we can all have that if we only know where to look for it.

A. PEACE WITH GOD.

The first thing to do is to be at peace with God. That means knowing who God is and who we are, that God is our Father and Creator and we are His sons and creatures. It means that the God who made us loves us and cares very much so much, in fact, that only just week on Good Friday He died on the cross to save us. That is who you and I and all men should love Him and serve Him every day of our lives. And if at times He allows the heavy hand of sorrow or pain or suffering to touch us and even crush us, we simply must realize that it is not because He has ceased to love us or has forgotten us, but because for His own good reasons that are hidden from our eyes, He is allowing us to be purified and drawn closer to

Him and made more and more to resemble His own Divine Son, Our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. If we honestly believe this, as Catholics then let us not love God in prosperity, only to turn on Him in our hour of grief. Rather, let us love God always and in all the events of life — this rugged life we lead here below. And that, of course, means loving Him with all our mind and heart and soul and strength always — in good days and in bad, in light and in shadow, in health and in pain. Believe me, there is no other way to keep unruffled that profound and basic peace of soul that is the joy of God. If a man hasn't got that — well, I don't know what will happen to him. The better blows and buffettings that come to all of us along the way will turn him hard and cold and cynical. And then, life becomes unbearable. So, if you want peace of soul, learn in the first place to trust the God who made you.

B. PEACE WITH NEIGHBOR:

In the second place, learn to be at peace with your neighbor, your fellowman. That is not always easy to do. God made everyone in the world, you know, and when He made them, He made them perfect. In fact He made their souls to His own very image and likeness. If, then, some people have, by sin, marred and torn and disfigured the unspeakable beauty of their souls that came forth perfect from the hand of God, don't blame God for it and don't lose faith in your fellowman, either. You cannot be expected to condone his sins, of course, you are not asked to do so. Nor are you expected to say that his faults are not really faults after all. All you are asked to do is to remember that no matter what he does, no matter how abominable his crimes or revolting his conduct — underneath it all is a tortured human soul that is still made to the image and likeness of God, a soul that is destined to be with God for all eternity, and that it will only forfeit that reward if it dies unrepentant in those sins. If you never allow yourself to lose that Christlike understanding of your fellowmen, you will not be tossed to and fro by the things that people do, even the worst of crimes. Because, then, you will remember, for one thing, that all of us are sinners and we all need mercy. And as for the great crimes that people sometimes commit, you'll recall with a deep, sobering humility: "There, but for the grace of God, go I."

C. PEACE WITH YOURSELF:

Finally, you will have and keep the joy of God in your heart, if you learn to live at peace with yourself. That means, among other things, to be satisfied with a reasonable amount of this world's goods and not to allow a vaulting ambition to goad you on and on in a mad pursuit of ever greater riches. I dare say that this particular brand of unrestrained ambition, all the more insidious as it is unrealized and unrecognized, is, perhaps, more than anything else, responsible for restlessness of soul, to say nothing of a bad case of ulcers.

Above all, however, the joy of God, that basic peace of soul and contentment that all men crave, comes from a clear conscience. There is no doubt about it, sin does give a certain thrill and passing pleasure. But it is passing. It does not last and requires satisfaction in ever-increasing doses until the saturation point is reached and then the sinner does not abandon sin; sin abandons him. And the remorse and guilt that follow are only a dread warning of the bitter punishment that awaits the sinner in the life to come. No, it is not worth it. A clean and clear conscience may not be glamorous as the world counts glamor, virtue never is. But it pays off in the end.

CONCLUSION:

Therefore, love God with your whole heart, with everything you are and have. Never lose faith in your fellowman's capacity for salvation. And as for yourself. Walk before God and live out your days in all holiness of life. Then, you will know a soul-satisfaction this world cannot give. For, it is too deep and too great. It is a foretaste of what, please God, awaits us when God gathers us to Himself.

God Bless You.

QUESTION BOX.

19.

QUESTION

"WHAT SHOULD BE DONE IF A CHILD IS BORN ALIVE AFTER IT HAS BEEN BAPTIZED ON SOME PART OTHER THAN THE HEAD?"

ANSWER

Such a child, after it is actually born, should be re-baptized on the forehead, but only conditionally—that is to say, on condition that it was not baptized properly and validly the first time. Thus, the person performing the second ceremony says 'If thou art not baptized, I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost'

QUESTION

"WHY HAVE THE LENTEN RULES BEEN CHANGED?"

ANSWER:

That's a good question. The rules of fasting in Lent have been made easier and more practical in order to make it possible for the great body of the Faithful to keep them. The older and stricter rules were not well suited for the cold climate of Canada, where we all need more food to keep healthy. The more lenient law of fasting that came in this year makes it possible for just about every Catholic to keep it. Believe me, it is a far cry from the severe penance the early Christians practiced in the first centuries of the Church.

QUESTION:

"WHY DO NON-CATHOLICS ADD THE WORDS: "FOR THINE IS THE KINGDOM AND THE POWER AND THE GLORY" AT THE END OF THE OUR FATHER?"

ANSWER:

They are very beautiful words, aren't they? Actually, however, Our Lord did not say them when He gave us the Our Father. It is

poetry well adjusted today that they were written into the margin by some copyist, probably some monk. The words themselves come from the Old Testament, and you can find not only the thought, but even the very words in the First Paralipomenon or I Chronicles, the 29th Chapter, 11th verse. That is why in more recent translations of the Bible even the non-Catholic versions, they are omitted from the end of the Our Father. They are beautiful words, but Our Lord simply did not say them.

QUESTION

'IS THERE ANY LAW OF THE CHURCH FORBIDDING MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN SITTING TOGETHER IN CHURCH? IF NOT WHY IS IT FORBIDDEN IN SOME CATHOLIC CHURCHES?'

ANSWER

No, there is no Church law whatever forbidding them to sit together. What you are referring to is one of the older customs in the Church that prescribed that the men and women sit apart. This was done partly for the sake of attention and less distraction on the part of the faithful and partly because women were not considered the equals of men socially. Remember the Church was born in the East where that custom holds even to this day. It spread to Europe and was the common custom until the last few centuries. Even in Europe today, they tell me, you can find traces of it. Here in the New World, no such distinction is made, but where some such local custom exists, remember that it is not without foundation.

QUESTION

'WHAT ABOUT THESE GOOD, PRACTICAL CATHOLICS WHO GO TO CHURCH ON SUNDAY, RECEIVE THE SACRAMENTS AND THEN CURSE AND SWEAR AND DRINK TO EXCESS THE REST OF THE WEEK?'

ANSWER

First of all, they are anything but good, practicing Catholics. They are simply bad Catholics and if they die that way they go to hell as fast as anyone else who is a hypocrite. Remember the Church of God is made up of over 400 million Catholics all over the world. With that number, you're bound to have your fair share of bad

DATE DUE SLIP

Catholics
His Chu
with not
good but
end of ti
mockery
are bad
pay for t
have the
living up

id that
a field
ot only
t at the
aking a
1. They
it. And
t. They
st not

Catholics. Our Lord Himself told us it would be so. He said that His Church, the Kingdom of God on earth would be like a field with not only wheat, but weeds in it; or like a fish-net with not only good but bad fish in it. And He said that He'd sort them out at the end of time. So, if you know of any Catholics who are making a mockery out of the Faith, don't blame the Faith, blame *them*. They are bad Catholics not because of the Faith, but *in spite of it*. And pray for them, in all charity, because, believe me, they need it. They have the priceless treasure of the Catholic Faith; they're just not living up to it.

A11581

